

The Review of English Studies

VOL. XXII.—No. 88.

OCTOBER, 1946

NOTES ON OLD ENGLISH POETRY

By KENNETH SISAM

Genesis B 313-7 (MS. Junius 11)

þær hæbbað heo on æfyn ungemet lange
ealra feonda gehwilc fyr edneowe;
þonne cymð on uhtan easterne wind,
forst fyrum cald; symble fyr oððe gar,
sum heard gewrinc habban sceoldon;

For MS. *gewrinc*, modern editors accept Grein's *geswinc*, which renders *tribulatio* in some Biblical texts. But, whatever the explanation of *gar* in *fyr oððe gar*, these words indicate violent tortures, so that *geswinc* gives a weak effect. Read *geþwinc* = *geþwing*, Old Saxon *gethuung* 'torment' as in *Heliand* 2144f:

Thar ist gristgrimmo endi gradag fiur,
hard helleo gethuung, het endi thiustri.

In the only other English example, *Genesis B* 696 *hellgeþwin*, the erasure of final *g* in the MS. indicates that the word was unfamiliar; and at line 802, for which the Old Saxon source is available, the verb *thuungan* is translated by O. E. *slitan*.

Genesis B 327-9

 hie hyra gal beswac,
engles oferhygd, noldon Alwaldan
word weorþian; hæfdon wite micel: etc.

The use of *engel* after their Fall deserves notice, though it is easier to explain than the singular *engles* in a plural context. Certainly Lucifer's arrogance has been referred to earlier in the poem (262, 272); but that does

not justify the interpretation *engles* = 'Lucifer's' in this passage, where it is emphasized that arrogance is the fault of all the fallen angels (332, 337), and where *engles oferhygd* is naturally taken as a variant of *hyra gal*. Nor does Old English usage allow us to take the singular as generic, translating 'angelic arrogance'.

Must we be content with the manuscript reading even though it involves such difficulties? Recent practice favours that choice: an editor's reputation for soundness would gain rather than lose by his tenacious defence of the manuscript, unless its reading were as patently wrong as *gewrinc* in the previous passage. If this attitude has a basis in reason, it implies that the extant manuscripts of Old English poetry represent the original compositions with a high degree of accuracy. Yet there seems to be no modern work which attempts to establish a thesis so fundamental. To say that 'an accurate scribe did not as a rule depart from the *wording* of his original except as a result of oversight'¹ is begging the question, unless the editor goes on to enquire whether the scribes with whom he is concerned were accurate in this sense, and whether, since the assumed date of composition, the transmission of the text has been entirely in the hands of scribes who aimed at copying what was before them. A following note deals mainly with the first of these questions; and in anticipation of the argument, I propose to read here *egle oferhygd* '(their) pernicious arrogance'. *Oferhygd egle* occurs in *Daniel* 679. In *Guthlac* 935 (= 962) the MS. has *engle* for *egle*, in *Christ* 762 *englum* for *eglum*.

ON THE AUTHORITY OF OLD ENGLISH POETICAL MANUSCRIPTS

This subject could well occupy a monograph, and even a selective treatment requires many illustrative examples. One might start from the considerable number of gross errors that appear in the principal manuscripts; but single lapses are not necessarily inconsistent with a high general level of accuracy, and that is the quality to be discussed.

¹ R. W. Chambers' Preface to *Beowulf*, 1914, p. xxvi. There is much that should be common ground in this persuasive manifesto of the school which makes the defence or conservation of the manuscript readings its ruling principle, and is therefore called 'conservative'. The term does not imply a generally conservative attitude in criticism.

The history of opinion has its interest. The headship of this school in Old English poetry belongs to R. P. Wülker, who succeeded Grein as editor of the *Bibliothek der angelsächsischen Poesie*. In the Preface to his first volume (1883) he announced: 'In bezug auf die textherstellung habe ich mich . . . bemüht möglichst die lesungen der handschrift zu wahren'. The best textual critics of that brilliant time were grateful for the materials he provided, which were then not so accessible as they are now; but they joked at his obtuseness: Cosijn pencilled *unsinnigen* before *lesungen* in his copy of the volume. In 1894, when Wyatt declared in his Preface to *Beowulf* that anyone who himself proposed emendations suffered from 'the greatest disqualification for discharging duly the functions of an editor', he drew a protest from Zupitza, who excelled in editorial judgement. In 1914 Chambers could fairly say that the battle for conservatism was won.

Nearly all the poetical texts depend on a single manuscript; but the contents of three out of the four great codices show a very small overlap. Thus both the Exeter Book and the Vercelli Book contain a poem on the Soul and the Body. The following specimen is set out in short or half lines for convenience of comparison, and substantial differences are italicized in both texts:—

A Exeter Book

- Sceal se gæst cuman
gehþum hremig
10 symle ymb seofon niht
sawle findan
pone lichoman
þe heo ær lange wæg
þreo hund wintra
butan ær *wyrce*
ece dryhten
æelmihtig god
ende worlde.
- 15 Cleopað þonne swa cearful
caldan reorde
spriceð grimlice
gæst to þam duste
hwæt drugu þu dreorga
to hwon dreahtest þu me
eorþan fylnes
eal forweornast
lames gelicnes
lyt þu gepohtes
- 20 to won þinre sawle sið
siþpan wurde
siþpan heo of lichoman
læded wære.

Vercelli Book

- Sceal se gast cuman
geohðum hremig
symble ymbe seofon niht
sawle findan
pone lichoman
þe hie ær lange wæg
þreo hund wintra
butan ær *þeodcýning*
- æelmihtig god
ende worulde
wyrcean wille
weoruda dryhten.
- Cleopað þonne swa cearful
cealdan reorde
spreceð grimlice
se gast to þam duste.
Hwæt druð ðu dreorega
to hwan drehrest ðu me
eorðan fulnes
eal forwisnad
lames gelicnes
lyt ðu gemundest
- to hwan þinre sawle þing
siðpan wurde
syððan of lichoman
læded wære.

The next specimen from the *Daniel-Azarias* verses allows a comparison of the Exeter Book with MS. Junius 11. It does not show the widest divergences of content, but evidently contains a deep-seated corruption:—

B Exeter Book (*Azarias*)

- þu him gehete
þurh hleoþorcwidas
þæt þu hyra fromcyn
on fyrndagum
ycan wolde
þæt hit æfter him

MS. Junius 11 (*Daniel*)

- þu him *þæt* gehete
þurh hleoðorcwyde
þæt þu hyra fromcyn
in fyrndagum
ican wolde
þætte æfter him

B Exeter Book (*Azarias*)MS. Junius 11 (*Daniel*)

- 35 on *cyneryce*
 cenned wurde
yced on eorþan
þæt swa untime
had to hebban
 swa heofonsteorran
 bugað bradne hwearft
 oð brimflodas.
swa waropa sond
ymb sealt wæter
- 40 *yþe geond eargrund*
þæt swa untime
ymb wintra hwearft
 weorðan sceolde.

on *cneorissum*
 cenned wurde
and seo mænigeo
mære wære
hat to hebbanne
 swa heofonsteorran
bebugað bradne hwyrft
 oð *þæt brimfaro* þæs
sæfaroda sand
geond sealtne wæg
me are gryndeð
þæt his unrim a
in wintra worn
 wurðan sceolde.

320

325

Two manuscripts are available for lines 30-94 of *Salomon and Saturn*, MS. CCCC 422 of the second half of the tenth century and a fragment in the margin of CCCC 41 which may be a century later.¹ Lines 75-84 will serve as a sample:—

C MS. CCCC. 422

MS. CCCC. 41

- 75 He is modigra
 middangearde
 staðole strengra
 ðonne ealra stana gripe
 lamena he is læce
 leoht wincendra
 swilce he is deaфра duru
dumbra tunge
 scyldigra scyld
 scyppendes seld
- 80 flodes ferigend
 folces nerigend
 yða yrfeweard
 earmra fisca
and wyrma welm
 wildeora holt
 on westenne weard
 weorðmynda gearð.

He is modigra
 middangeardes
 staðole *he is* strengra
 pone calle stana gripe
 lamana he is læce
 leoht winciendra
 swilce he his deaфра duru
deadra tunge
 scildigra scild
 scippendes seld

flodes ferient
 folces neriend
 yða yrfeweard
 earma fixa
wyrma wolenco
 wildeora holt
 westenes weard
 weorðmynta gearð.

¹ I have not seen this MS. The latest editor, Mr. R. J. Menner, whose readings I follow, dates the hand 'at the end of the eleventh or beginning of the twelfth century'. Mr. Neil Ker tells me he would place it considerably earlier. It is disadvantageous to use such a late copy, because the great bulk of the poetry is contained in MSS. of the second half of the tenth century—Exeter Book, Vercelli Book, Junius 'Caedmon' (original part), Beowulf MS., MS. CCCC 422 of *Salomon and Saturn*; and new factors affecting transmission may arise in MSS. written much after that time. I have excluded the poems contained in the Chronicle partly for this reason, partly because they are all late compositions transmitted in an unusual way. Similarly *Be Domes Dæge* is left out of account.

I am concerned only with the amount of variation and the nature of the variants, not with their merits. There are differences of inflexion, e.g. **B** *hleoporcwidas: hleoporcwýde*, sometimes with other modifications, as **C** *on westenne weard: westenes weard*, or **A** *forweornast: forwísnad*. Minor words are added or omitted, e.g. **C** *stabole [he is] strengra*, or **A** *[se] gast*. Prepositions are varied, e.g. **B** *ymb wintra hwearft: in wintra worn*. Substitution of one word for another is common:—Sometimes the forms are similar e.g. **C** *welm: wlenco*; and, with inferior alliteration in the first reading, **B** *swa waroþa: sæfaroða*. Sometimes the words have the same alliteration and rough sense, as **B** *ymb sealt water: geond sealtne wæg*; sometimes only the alliteration is the same, as **B** *cynerice: cneorissum*; sometimes only the meaning and syllabic weight, as **A** *geþohtes: gemundest*. Omissions or additions with considerable rearrangement occur at **A** 13 f. There is a new composition at **B** 320, and *þæt swa unrim* in the *Azarias* text recurs below. **B** *ype geond eargrund: me are gryndeð* shows the making of a crux. At **B** 322 the *Daniel* scribe fails to recognize *brimsfaropes*, and points the verse before the last syllable, which he takes to be the word *þæs*. At **A** 17 both copies bungle the formula *Hwæt druge þu?* (*Genesis* 888, *Juliana* 247), so creating, even for Bosworth-Toller's Supplement and the latest editors,¹ a noun variously identified as *druh*, *drug*, *druhþu*, *drugupþu*, and supposed to mean 'dust'.

In sum, the number of variants is very large. Though they are of a pedestrian kind,² many of them cannot be accounted for by simple errors of a scribe's eye or ear. More often than not they make metre and some sense: even **C** *deadra tunge* might be defended if there were no second manuscript to support *dumbra*. But as compared with the variants in classical texts, they show a laxity in reproduction and an aimlessness in variation which are more in keeping with the oral transmission of verse. An editor who has these passages in mind, will not regard the integrity of a late manuscript as axiomatic.

All the major manuscripts already sampled were written within one half century, and all come from the South or South Midlands, an area which was fairly homogeneous in literary language and culture at that time. It is possible to reach back into earlier times and different conditions because three short pieces, recorded in the eighth or ninth centuries, are also found in late tenth century copies: they are *Cædmon's Hymn*, the *Leiden Riddle*, and the *Ruthwell Cross* runic inscriptions.

The *Ruthwell Cross* runes, which are not necessarily as old as the *Cross*

¹ Krapp, *Vercelli Book*, 1932, p. 126; Krapp and Dobbie, *Exeter Book*, 1936, pp. 175, 317; Mackie, *Exeter Book* (E. E. T. S., 1934), p. 74 f.

² A variant is exceptionally preserved in the MS. at *Christ* 1653: *ðær is leofra lufu, lif butan ende deaðe*; where *ende* makes an *a' r*st inevitable phrase, and the alternative *deaðe* matches the group of opposites that follows.

itself, give four groups of verses that can be identified in the Vercelli Book between lines 38 and 64 of the *Dream of the Rood*. The latter poem is so different in bulk, and so uneven in quality, that a comparison could not favour the hypothesis of accurate transmission; and the first inscription differs remarkably from the corresponding lines in the Vercelli Book:—¹

(on)geredæ hinæ god almeġttig þa he walde on galgu gistiga
modig fore (allæ) men bug . . .

Ongyrede hine þa geong hæleð, þæt wæs God ælmihtig,
strang ond stiðmod. Gestah he on gealgan heanne,
modig on manigra gesyhðe, þa he wolde mancyn lysan.

Bifode ic þa me se beorn ymbclypte; ne dorste ic hwære bugan to eorðan . . .

The absence of any probable alliteration in the second runic line is evidence of adaptation to the special purpose, and it would be unsafe to make much of the detailed variants where the conditions of recording are so abnormal.

The exceptional character of *Cædmon's Hymn* is marked by the many copies in which it appears.² If manuscripts later than the tenth century are excluded, the reproduction of the original words is fairly good, with four minor and one major variants, of which only the last, *eorðan* (*bearnum*) for *aelda*, can be traced back to the ninth century. But it is a very short piece of miraculous origin, and it has been preserved as a quotation in historical prose texts, either the Latin of Bede's *History* or the late ninth-century English translation from it. Here the conditions of transmission are abnormal, and again it is unsafe to rely on the evidence.

There remains the *Leiden Riddle*, found in a ninth-century Continental manuscript and in the Exeter Book. A specimen is unnecessary because the two manuscripts have often been printed side by side.³ Apart from details of inflexion and uncertainties of reading in the Leiden MS., there are half a dozen variants of some importance in 16 corresponding lines, and the last two lines of the Leiden version, which are supported by the Latin original, have been replaced by a conventional riddle-ending in the Exeter Book. The degree of variation is not very different from that exhibited in the much shorter Riddle 31, of which two copies survive by an exceptional chance in the Exeter Book.

In these three pieces the tenth century texts show no attempt to reproduce the archaic or dialectal forms and spellings of the earlier copies: Bodleian MS. Tanner 10 of *Cædmon's Hymn* and the early eighth-century

¹ See *The Dream of the Rood*, ed. Bruce Dickins and A. S. C. Ross, 1945.

² See *The Manuscripts of Cædmon's Hymn and Bede's Death Song* by E. van K. Dobbie (New York, 1937). I omit *Bede's Death Song*: the Northumbrian text is preserved in Continental MSS. from the ninth century onwards; but, for comparison, there is only a very late West Saxon text, equally uniform, preserved in MSS. from the twelfth century onwards. Its five variants from the Northumbrian text have no claim to authority.

³ See especially *Three Northumbrian Poems*, ed. A. H. Smith, 1933.

Moore MS. are identical only in a few invariable words. Ample evidence from other sources confirms that copyists of Old English texts were not expected to reproduce their originals letter for letter, as they were when copying Latin and especially Biblical texts. Modernization of forms in the course of transmission was allowed and even required by the use for which Old English works were intended,¹ and the practice was obviously dangerous for the wording.

A defender of the manuscript readings might well say that the evidence so far adduced is not ample or varied enough, and might argue that the scribes were well trained, and that they knew more about Old English usage, thought and tradition than a modern critic can. I doubt if this holds good for the earlier poetry. In *Beowulf*, recent editors agree that the first scribe writes *gara* (*cyn*) 461 clearly and boldly for *Wedera* (*cyn*), without sense or alliteration, with no likeness in script or sound, or anything in the surrounding verses to mislead him; and the aberration is passed over in their commentaries. For *Cain* 1261 (misread as *cam*) he writes *camp* 'battle', just as in *Genesis* 1938, 2400, *Loth* becomes *leoht* with no glimmering of sense. At a critical point in the Finn episode (1127 ff.), he leaves us the meaningless *Hengest . . . wunode mid finnel unhlitme*. Rather different is 1960 f. :—*ponon geomor woc haledum to helpe*, where, misled by a possible spelling or pronunciation of the initial diphthong, he has taken the proper name *Eomær* for the common adjective *geomor* 'sad'.² I have previously

¹ This has a bearing on attempts to defend the MS. reading *wundini golde* in *Beowulf* 1382, where the slight emendation *wundnū* = *wundnum* had become established. It is not quite certain that *wundini* is the reading of the MS., and it is very doubtful whether a form *wundini* ever existed: in the recorded *-numini*, all the examples of which may go back to a single late seventh-century gloss, the stem is short. But if there were no such doubts, it is most unlikely that this extraordinary ending would survive for three centuries, in a common word and phrase, to appear in the *Beowulf* MS. It would require, in this one place only, a suspension of the normalizing practice of scribes, and minutely accurate unintelligent copying throughout the whole long chain of transmission. That the acceptance of this reading leads to startling conclusions about the written tradition of *Beowulf* is another reason for preferring the simpler solution *wundnum*.

The habit of normalizing helps to explain some corrupt readings. In the Paris Psalter 72, 11 *sine causa* (*justificari cor meum*) is rendered, according to modern editors: 'peah þe ic on [me] ingcan ænigne [ne] wiste &c.'. It is more likely that *ic intingcan* was the original reading, that *i* dropped out leaving *ic in ingcan*, and a scribe changed *in* to *on*, as he would the preposition. The only other place where *causa* has to be translated is Ps. 73, 21 *iudica causam tuam*: 'dem þine nu ealde intingan'.

² The MS. reading *geomor* has been defended, e.g. *Mod. Phil.* ii, 54 ff. Faith in the accuracy of this scribe, or his kind, underlies the doctrine that, in one poem or tradition, the same person sometimes has two authentic names, metrically equivalent and similar in script, but etymologically different in the significant first element: e.g. *Beow.* 467 *Heregar* beside *Heorogar* 61 and *Hiorogar* (second scribe) 2158; or *Oslof* 1148 beside *Ordlof* in the Finnsburh fragment. That two names, having such practical inconveniences and no technical purpose, should be maintained for centuries within a single poem or tradition, seems to me to be a major improbability, which is not much lessened by evidence (e.g. in Klaeber's *Beowulf*, 1936, p. xxxii, n. 5) that some persons who can be identified in both literatures have Old English names differing in formation from their Scandinavian names. It is more likely that a scribe has slipped again, where he should have written *Heorogar*, *Or(d)lof*.

noted¹ a similar instance in the Exeter Book where *onsyne beorg* appears in *Christ* 876, 900 for *on Sione beorg*, because the scribe mistook *onsione* for the common noun meaning 'face' &c.; and MS. Junius 11 shows the same misunderstanding in *Exodus* 386 *onseone* (*beorh*) for *on Sione*. All these are proper names, which I have preferred because there can be little doubt about the true reading when a name is miswritten. To show that the scribe misunderstood the meaning of common words, we must use conjectural emendations, and, though I shall indulge in conjecture from this point, there is a risk of arguing in a circle. But in *Juliana* 482, the bad form *hyradreorge* (for *heoru-*) arose because the first element was mistaken for the pronoun *heora*, which usually has the form *hyra* in the Exeter Book.² In *Genesis* 2174 f.

Hwæt gifest þu me, gasta waldend,
freomanna to frofre, nu ic þus feascraft eom?

it can hardly be doubted that a scribe has lost the sense by substituting *freomanna*, a legal not a poetical word, for *fremena* gen. pl. 'benefits' depending on *hwæt*. And because one can seldom prove that the scribe was alert when he wrote something wrong, it is worth noting a scrap of evidence at *Beowulf* 1981: *hwearf | geond þæt* (side) *reced* *Hæreðes dohtor*. Here the copyist has added *side* as a correction above the line, which shows that his attention was directed to an error; and, for the sake of the alliteration, the editors must either reject his correction, or assume a lacuna after *reced* which escaped him. But there is no need to multiply indications that the scribes were often ignorant, or inattentive to the meaning.

As a last resort, it might be argued in defence of the poetical manuscripts that their authority is confirmed because they have passed the scrutiny of Anglo-Saxon readers, who knew things unknown to us. In fact there is hardly a trace of intelligent scrutiny. It is a curious feature of the great poetical codices that no early reader seems to have noticed the most glaring errors left by the scribe.

My argument has been directed against the assumption that Anglo-Saxon poetical manuscripts are generally good, in the sense that, except for an inevitable sprinkling of errors, they faithfully reproduce the words of much older originals. It does not attempt to establish that all the poems

¹ *R.E.S.*, Vol. x., p. 340.

² *R.E.S.*, Vol. x., p. 340. Should not *Exodus* 218 *habban heora hlencan* be read *habban heorahlencan*? (Sievers' expanded D-type, with extra alliteration which is not objectionable in the context.) In MS. Junius 11 the elements of a compound are often separated, and the MS. arrangement here is the same in *Exodus* 181 *heorawulfas*. *Hiorserce* occurs in *Beow.* 2539; *wahlence* in *Exodus* 176; but *hlence* by itself nowhere means 'coat of chain-mail', and such a meaning for the simplex is not likely. The passage has been used to emend *Finnsburh* 11 *habbað eowre landa*, which has a modern ring. Here we have to do with what Hickes and his printer made of the lost MS., and perhaps *habbað* (*h*)*eorelinda* is worth considering, though that compound is not recorded.

have survived in bad texts: three such pieces as *Widsið*, *Juliana*, and the *Gnomic Verses*, all preserved in the Exeter Book, may well have been subjected to different chances in their earlier transmission, and there may be reasons for believing that some poems were lucky.

Nor should acceptance of this argument discourage the habit of constant recourse to the manuscripts. Long after all the letters that can be read in them are settled in cold print (and not many finds like Mr. J. C. Pope's *Geatisc meowle*¹ at *Beow.* 3150 can now be expected), they will repay close study, because they are the primary witnesses. If there were enough of them, all the facts about the written transmission would be in evidence.

But when, as is usual for Old English poetry, only one late witness is available, there is no safety in following its testimony. The difference between a better reading and a worse is, after all, a matter of judgement; and however fallible that faculty may be, the judge must not surrender it to the witness. To support a bad manuscript reading is in no way more meritorious than to support a bad conjecture, and so far from being safer, it is more insidious as a source of error. For, in good practice, a conjecture is printed with some distinguishing mark which attracts doubt; but a bad manuscript reading, if it is defended, looks like solid ground for the defence of other readings. So intensive study with a strong bias towards the manuscript reading blunts the sense of style, and works in a vicious circle of debasement.²

As a simple example, the Vercelli MS. reading *Hwæt, dru h ðu dreorega* in *Soul and Body* 17, already mentioned, provides not only a ghost-word *dru h* etc., but a form of apostrophe new to Old English verse in its word order. A more complex example comes from the narrative passage in *Genesis A* which describes the flight of the raven and the dove from the Ark, lines 1443 ff.:—³

Noe tealde, þæt he on neod hine,
 gif he on þære lade land ne funde,
 ofer sid wæter secan wolde
 on wagþele; eft him seo wen ge Leah;
 ac se feond[e] gespearn fleotende hreaw:
 salwigfeðera secan nolde.
 He (sc. Noe) þa ymb seofon niht etc.

¹ *The Rhythm of Beowulf*, 1942, p. 233.

² The process extends to grammar. It is enough to quote the most distinguished English commentator of the conservative school, R. W. Chambers, defending the MS. reading *licad leng swa wel* at *Beow.* 1854 against Grein's conjecture *sel*: 'If one finds gross anomalies in accidence in the *Beowulf*, why should one look for a flawless syntax?' (Here, it should be noticed, there is confusion between the late MS. of *Beowulf*, to which the *if*-clause must refer, and the text to be derived from it by critical methods, to which the *apodosis* refers). The principles of phonology must also yield: in Boethius *Metra* xxxi, 11 the editors and modern dictionaries accept *fierfete* 'four-footed' on the evidence of Junius's transcript of a leaf since destroyed, though *fier-* is against all rules, and the regular word is *fiderfete*.

³ The text is that of Holthausen (1914), and Krapp (1931).

The last two complete lines are interpreted 'but he (the raven), rejoicing, alighted on a floating corpse: the dark-feathered (bird) would not seek'. I find them ungrammatical, for *secan* is never left in the air like this in a sound text, and it is the more intolerable with *secan nolde* just above, and *sohte, secan* in the following lines, all with the regular object. The abruptness of the expression is equally disturbing, because the narrative in the whole passage is full and easy, and the poet has gone to a commentary for more about the raven than the Bible tells. The indications are that at least a line is missing, probably after *hrewa*, which contained the object of *secan*. But if such a manuscript text is regarded as sound, the chances are small that any lacuna of a line or more will be admitted on internal evidence. In fact, few are admitted by modern editors.¹

There is, then, no escape from the task of questioning our single witness, beginning with tests of general credibility like those I have suggested already. If the results are not satisfying, we must examine and cross-examine on every sign of weakness in particular places. Thus in line 1446 of the passage just quoted, how is *eft* to be accounted for in the second half-verse? Noah has not been disappointed before, and the formula *him seo wen geleah* is elsewhere a complete half-verse (*Gen.* 49, *Beow.* 2323, *Andr.* 1074). Here the manuscript pointing of the verse is at fault. In the next line

¹ When there is only one MS., gaps, other than those due to its physical condition, may sometimes be established from our knowledge of the subject matter. But generally lacunæ are conjectural. The weakness of such conjectures is that they are vaguer than specified readings, and therefore easy. Still, they should be considered on the balance of probability. Note:—

(i) The mechanical dropping of one or more verse lines, which is common in MSS. of Latin poetry, is not so likely in Old English MSS., because in them the written line rarely corresponds with the verse. If the copyist dropped a line or more of his pattern MS., the ragged parts of two verses would usually be brought together, and metre as well as sense would show up the fault. If the omission escaped the copyist, subsequent patching up is likely.

(ii) But one would expect a kind of omission to which Latin verse is not subject: the feeling for alliteration was strong, and when the scribe had written part of a verse, his eye might drop to a verse below with the same alliteration. So a lacuna could occur with no break in the alliteration. This possibility should be taken into account in such places as *Beow.* 1931, where Old English usage gives the clear indication that *modþryðo* is a compound abstract noun, object of *wæg*. (*Gen.* 2238 *hygeþryðe wæg*; *Guthlac* 982 *hygesorge wæg*, 1309 *gnornsorge wæg*; *Elene* 61 *modsorge wæg*, 655 *gnornsorge wæg*; *Beow.* 152 *hetenidas wæg*, 2780 *ligegesian wæg*: all second half-lines). See also Craigie, 'Interpolations and Omissions in Anglo-Saxon Poetic Texts' *Philologica*, II (1923-24).

In *Azarias* 109 ff.,

þu þæs geornlice
wyrceſt wuldorcýning waestmum herge
bletsien bledum etc.

pretty clearly a subject has been lost before *waestmum* or after *herge*, and the Latin *benedicta terra Dominum* confirms it. But rather than admit a lacuna, modern editors (Grein-Wülker and Krapp-Dobbie) assume an unknown fem. pl. *herge*, a meaning 'groves' otherwise unrecorded in Old English, and the free choice in this context of a word with peculiarly heathen associations; although *hergen* 'let them praise' occurs six times elsewhere in this paraphrase of the *Canticum Trium Puerorum*, thrice in association with *bletsien*. It is an example of the speculation which is induced by too much faith in the manuscript.

feonde 'rejoicing' for MS. *feond* was suggested by Grein and confirmed by Cosijn; but there is no good evidence for a simple verb *feon* beside regular *gefeon*, and it is especially awkward in the present participle. Then again, a demonstrative pronoun *se* 'he' so clumsily separated from its noun *hrefn* is hardly possible: it is better to take *se* as a consequence of the misreading *feond*, and to substitute *he* as a necessary part of Grein's proposed emendation.

The cluster of difficulties in these few lines shows how complicated corruption may be. If the average text offered by the manuscripts were open to so many doubts, a critic's work would be hopeless. But long stretches have no such obvious faults: whether or not they represent the exact words of the original composer, they make good sense, grammar and metre by the standards at present available. So a proper respect for the manuscripts is consistent with a critical and independent attitude towards their evidence. Nothing is to be gained by judging them with a hostile bias; and occasionally they still offer readings which modern editors have rejected, and which deserve to be restored.¹

Because our means of criticizing the manuscripts are still so small, and some of them are weak from disuse, the change of approach which I suggest would not produce texts very different from those that are now reckoned good. Editors would less often write as if they were presenting a distant original exactly, except for its archaic and dialectal forms. They would also be less ready to cumber the text with palæographical features or linguistic oddities from the late manuscript: the first are useless in an age of cheap and good photography, for palæography cannot be learnt

¹ In *Elene* 925 *Gen ic findan can . . . wiðercyr wiððan*, the editors since Grein read *siððan* with feeble sense. In *Guthlac* 405 *lc eow soð wiððon secgan wille*, they again alter to *siððon*. In *Menology* 146 *hæfð nu lif wið þan*, the alteration is not possible. The meaning in *Elene* and *Guthlac* is 'Still I can devise a counter-stroke against that' &c., and the MS. readings are sound. *Wið þan* fills a similar place in the verse in *Paris Psalter* 118, 158: and *ic þand wið þan þe hi teala noldan | þinre spræce sped gehealdan*, where *þriste* should be read for MS. *teala*.

Again, in his edition of *Genesis A*, Holthausen has the courage to say that he does not understand line 1400 in the account of the Flood:—

		Fiftena stod
	deop ofer dunum	se drencfeod
	monnes elna.	þæt is mære wyrd
1400	þam set nichstan was	nan to gedale,
	nymþe heo[f] was ahafen	on þa hean lyft etc.

Bouterwek, who established this punctuation in 1849, described the passage as *sehr dunkel*, and it troubled Cosijn and Sievers (Paul and Braune's *Beiträge*, xix., 448 f.). If MS. *heo* is restored instead of Sievers' suggestion *heof* 'lamentation', and if *þæt is mære wyrd* is bracketed as a parenthesis, for which there is an exact parallel at *Gen.* 2566, the MS. reading makes grammar and sense:—'Fifteen of our (*monna*) ells above the mountains stood the whelming flood (that was a great marvel!); and at last there was none to divide the flood (*þam . . . to gedale*) unless it (*sc. seo dun*) rose up to the high firmament.' This is not far from the Latin: 'opertique sunt omnes montes excelsi sub universo caelo. Quindecim cubitis altior fuit aqua super montes quos operuerat'.

from type; the second raise more delicate problems, but the retention, e.g. of the normal nominative plural form *yrfeweardas* at *Beow.* 2453, where it stands for the normal genitive singular *yrfeweardes*, is a nuisance to the reader.¹

One might expect a considerable increase in the number of places marked as cruces, i.e. places where the manuscript reading is judged to be unsound and there is no convincing conjecture to replace it. Klaeber in his standard edition of *Beowulf* (1936) marks only one crux (*mwatide* 2226) and one lacuna of a few words at line 62; Chambers marks the lacuna but not the crux; Sedgefield admits neither. For a text of the form and content of *Beowulf*, subject, according to these editors, to the vicissitudes of three centuries, this residue of faults detected and not made good is incredibly small. It indicates that comfortable conventions have become established, so that healthy doubts have been stilled.

An increase in the number of recognized cruces would cause some conjectural readings to disappear from the text. But, in compensation, some others would replace manuscript readings which are now retained on the assumption that a single late manuscript has extraordinary authority; and there would be a real gain if conjecture, instead of being reserved for the useful but disheartening task of dealing with obvious or desperate faults, were restored to its true functions, which include probing as well as healing.

¹ The historical grammar of Late West Saxon is a neglected subject, but poetical MSS. and commentaries on poetry are not the places in which it can best be studied, and the editors are far from consistent. Thus the *Beowulf* MS. has *Ecþeow* fourteen times, but *Ecþeow* 263 with *g* added later by the scribe, and *Ecþeow* unaltered 957; *Ecglaf* four times, but *Eclaf* 980; and *sec* 2863. Chambers follows the MS. at 957, 980; 'corrects' *sec* to *secg*; and fails to note that *Ecþeow* was originally written at 263. Klaeber, who assembles the facts, regularizes throughout. But instead of normalizing MS. *siexbennum* 2904 to *seax-*, Klaeber reads *sex-* which is a conjectural form based on an assumed confusion with the numeral. In the *Beowulf* MS. *siex-* would be an exceptional form of 'six', and an alternative explanation is possible. There is a late *ie* for *ea* which has escaped Sievers' Grammar. It is common in the mid-eleventh-century Cambridge Psalter (ed. Wildhagen, 1910), which has *ie* not only in *wieax* = *wæax* n., *geþieht*, *iee* = *eac*, and in *ciesty* = *coaster*, but also in *iert* = *eart*, *sielm* = *sealm*, *lies* = *leas*, etc. This MS. has Canterbury connexions, and the second hand of the *Beowulf* MS. shows South-Eastern forms; but as some other examples of late *ie* = *ea* are not clearly South-Eastern, I merely note the alternative explanation. An inclination towards standard spellings in the printed text has a further advantage, because in these details too scribes make mistakes, not all of which can be accounted for. Beside *missere*, editors and dictionaries accept a form *missare*, which is a possible alternative in Old Norse but not in Old English. It is inferred from the dat. pl. *missarum* in *Gen.* 2345, where I have little doubt that the scribe thought of *missarum*, gen. pl. of the familiar Church Latin *missa*. In Old English there are such errors due to the religious preoccupations of the copyists. Thus *heofon* for *geofon* 'ocean' occurs in the MS. of *Andreas* 393, 1508 and 1585, where the corrections were made by Kemble (1843). And *amen* for *agmen*, *angelo* for *angulo* in classical MSS. (see L. Havet, *Manuel de critique verbale*, 1911, p. 263 f.), are in the same kind as *engle* for *egle*, which was our starting point.

THYN OWNE BOOK: A NOTE ON CHAUCER, GOWER AND OVID

BY NORMAN CALLAN

The two versions of the tale of Pyramus and Thisbe¹ obviously afford an opportunity for comparing the way in which Chaucer and Gower handle their original: Gower's version is one of his best stories, and Chaucer, if not at his greatest, is sufficiently captivated by the tale to make of it something more than the routine affair which most of the *Legend* is. Editors² have pointed out similarities and divergencies; but they are more concerned to assess the Latinity of their authors and their fidelity to the original than to discuss the poetic use each makes of Ovid—the point in which the interest of the comparison should, if anywhere, lie. It might be fairly retorted that editorial notes are not the place for such discussion: but even if

The name of everich gan to other springe
By women that were neighebores aboute³

is a misrendering of Ovid's

notitiam primosque gradus vicinia fecit⁴

—though probably the emphatic *vicinia*, sticking in Chaucer's mind, suggested the lines without any thought of translation—we are little further on. We are not enabled to say that Chaucer could not read Latin: we know very well that he could. Even less helpful, because definitely misleading, is such a statement as that Gower 'omits Ovid's *quid non sentit amor*?'⁵ Had moral Gower in fact let slip such a chance for sententiousness it would indeed have been surprising; but the truth is that he expands these four words (or his 'memorial reconstruction' of them) to twice that number of lines:

Who loveth wel, it mai noht misse,
And namely whan ther be tuo
Of one accord, howso it go
Bot if that thei som weie finde;
For Love is evere of such a kinde
And hath his folk so wel affaited,

¹ *Legend of Good Women*, 686 ff.; *Confessio Amantis*, III, 1331 ff.

² See *The Works of John Gower*, ed. G. C. Macaulay, vol. II, pp. 497 ff.: *The Works of Chaucer*, ed. W. W. Skeat, vol. III, pp. 314 ff.

³ *Legend of Good Women*, 719 ff.; cf. Macaulay, *op. cit.* vol. II, p. 498.

⁴ Ovid, *Metamorphoses* (ed. Postgate), IV, 59.

⁵ Macaulay, *loc. cit.*

That howso that it be awaited,
Ther mai no man the pourpos lette.¹

Nothing could better illustrate Gower's straightforward attitude. He found in Ovid (as who did not?) two things: unlimited material for the third, or moral degree² of glosing, and abundance of entertaining stories. As an interpreter he is quite as wilful as any of his contemporaries, enlarging or importing to suit his own purpose. Even when Chaucer is at his most didactic he still falls short of Gower. His *moralitas* for 'Thisbe' is an ironical apology for putting a man among the exemplars of faithfulness in love. Gower, along with incidental moralizing on the power of love, extracts from the tale a much more ethical admonition against suicide through 'folehaste'. One would have thought that the point of the story is (as in fact it seemed to Chaucer) precisely the reverse; but Gower has a simple mind, unencumbered with subtleties, and it is one of the incidental pleasures of reading the *Confessio Amantis* to see what surprising lessons he can extract from the most unpromising material. Aetna serves as an *exemplum* of Envie:

Ethna which brenneth yer be yere
Was thanne not so hot as I. . . .³

and even such a recondite piece of anthropology as the story of Teiresias⁴ affords him the moral that the laws of Nature are not to be interfered with.

In those stories where he is translating Ovid (always saving his *moralitas*)

¹ *Confessio Amantis*, III, 1362 ff.: cf. *Ovide Moralisé* (ed. Boer), IV, 551 ff.:

La crevace n'ert gaires grans
Et fu celee par mout d'ans
De ci qu'Amours la fist trouver,
Vers qui riens ne se puet celer.
Quel chose est ce qu'Amours ne sent?

On internal evidence it cannot be said whether Gower had this work in mind. Similarities of vocabulary may well be fortuitous; but the fact that both make the chink (in defiance of Ovid) a work of human ingenuity is interesting:

Tisbe trouva la crevellure
Prist le pendant de sa çainture,
S'en fist outre le chief paroir
Que ses amis le puist voir.

cf.

And thus betuene hem tuo thei sette
An hole upon a wall to make.

(1370 f.)

² Cf.

litera gesta docet, quid credas analogia,
moralis quid agas, quo tendas anagogia.

³ *Confessio Amantis*, II, 20 f.: cf. *Metamorphoses*, XIII, 867 ff. There is perhaps some justification in Ovid for this reading, though the point receives nothing like so much emphasis as Gower gives it either here or in the passage from the *Mirour* which Macaulay compares:

Ly mons Ethna quele art toutdiz,
Nulle autre chose du païs
Forsque soy mesmes poet ardoir;
Ensi q'Envie tient ou pis
En sentira deinz soy le pis

(II. 3805 ff.)

⁴ *Metamorphoses*, III, 324 ff.: cf. *Confessio Amantis*, III, 361 ff.

Gower keeps close to his original; but he is never the slave of it, and in this respect he is superior to Chaucer, who sometimes is. Where he thinks emotion wanting he supplies it. His Polyphemus, for instance, is so moved that, unprompted of Ovid,

He ran Ethna the hell aboute
Wher never yit the fir was oute,
Fulfilde of sorghes and gret disease,
That he syh Acis wel at ese.¹

While rendering a faithful account of Medea's spell-binding he feels, perhaps, that Ovid's Greek necromancy may be too abstruse; so he adds his own enthusiastic touch:

Somtime lich unto the cock,
Somtime unto the laverock,
Somtime kacleth as a Hen,
Somtime spekth as don the men;
And riht so as hir jargoun strangeth
In sondri wise hir forme changeth,
Sche semeth faie and no womman.²

Another instance, similar, though not closely so, shows the same attitude of mind at work. In his story of Actaeon Ovid has an elaborate description of the grotto of Diana:

vallis erat piceis et acuta densa cupressu
nomine Gargaphie, succinctae sacra Dianae.
cuius in extremo est antrum nemorale recessu,
arte laboratum nulla; simulaverat artem
ingenio natura suo; nam pumice vivo
et levibus tofis nativum duxerat arcum.
fons sonat a dextra, tenui perlucidus unda,
margine gramineo patulos succinctus hiatus.³

Such a set-piece of natural landscape gardening, which would have been familiar to Pope or Shenstone, or even to the Coleridge of 'Kubla Khan', is not to the taste of the fourteenth century. Gower takes a hint here and there, but his lines are to all intents original:

He syh upon the grene gras
The faire fresshe floures springe;
He herde among the leves singe
The throstle with the nyhtingale.
Thus ere he wiste into a dale
He cam where was a litel plein
Al round aboute wel besein
With buisshes grene and Cedres hyhe . . .⁴

The effect is, of course, to modernize and perhaps vulgarize Ovid, but it is Gower's way of making his original personal, and as such it is preferable

¹ *Confessio Amantis*, II, 162 ff.

² *Metamorphoses*, III, 155 ff.

³ *Ibid.* v, 4099 ff.

⁴ *Confessio Amantis*, I, 353 ff.

to Chaucer's more heavy-footed literalness in some of the 'Legends', where his rendering lacks either the spontaneity of Gower or the flash of poetic synthesis which characterizes his own greater work. 'The Legend of Lucretia'¹ for instance, keeps so tediously close to the *Fasti* that, though it affords an admirable opportunity for comparing the Latin and the English (and incidentally for questioning Chaucer's Latinity again²), it affords little else. 'Pyramus and Thisbe', however, is a different case. Macaulay³ was of the opinion that Chaucer worked with Ovid in front of him, Gower from memory; but to anyone making a comparison of the first fifty lines it must appear that Gower, far from working from a general recollection, is following Chaucer. That Chaucer had his Ovid before him I do not feel convinced. He certainly had in the 'Lucretia', and the effect is so dismally different from the 'Thisbe' that it is hard to believe that one poet could have produced two so dissimilar works when using the same method for both. Moreover there are in places such considerable departures from the original, especially in the ordering of the facts, that it is doubtful whether a writer embarking on a translation would at the same time have been able to accomplish what is largely a reconstruction. My own feeling is that Chaucer wrote from a recent perusal of the story; Gower from a recollection of Chaucer, Ovid, and perhaps the *Ovide Moralisé*.

But in examining the poetic use to which Ovid has been put, what matters is not the literalness or otherwise of the whole so much as certain outstanding points where Chaucer has been impressed by Ovid while Gower has not. They are points which no sensitive reader (and Gower was certainly sensitive) could have forgotten after even one reading.

The first is the comparatively rare word *coctilibus*:

(Ovid)	. . . ubi dicitur altam coctilibus muris cinxisse Semiramis urbem. ⁴
(Chaucer)	The whiche toun the queen Semiramus Leet dichen al about, and walles make Ful hye, of harde tyles wel ybake. ⁵
(Gower)	The cite which Semiramis Enclosed hath with wall aboute. ⁶

¹ *Legend of Good Women*, 1680 ff.; Ovid, *Fasti* (ed. Fraser), II, 721 ff. Cf. *Confessio Amantis*, VII, 4754 ff.

² See Skeat's note to *Legend of Good Women*, I, 1729.

³ Vol. II, p. 948: 'In short, Gower writes apparently from a general recollection of the story, while Chaucer evidently has his Ovid before him and endeavours to translate almost every phrase. . . . As an indication that Gower is following Chaucer one or two general points may be mentioned. Ovid begins with the names of Pyramus and Thisbe; Chaucer does not mention them for twenty lines, Gower for forty-five, and then in the same formula as Chaucer. Chaucer begins with the parents ('two lordes') and Gower does the same; Ovid has later merely 'sed vetuere patres'. Gower has the rime 'sene . . . betuene' at the spot where Chaucer has 'grene . . . betuene'.

⁴ *Metamorphoses*, IV, 57 f.

⁵ *Legend of Good Women*, 706 ff.

⁶ *Confessio Amantis*, III, 1332 f.

18

part because it held up the story, in part because lead-piping, like tiles, have a mean sound. Chaucer's reaction is more surprising and more interesting. One is tempted (following the trail blazed by Professor Livingstone Lowes) to say that for a Clerk of the Works building and plumbing would have an irresistible appeal. This may be part of the truth. What is more to the immediate purpose, however, is that whereas in the case of *coctilibus* Chaucer achieves his result by a sort of hammered-out literalness, here he is more tentatively allusive. In the first case his line has a feeling of solidarity and dignity, like Ovid's but stronger than his; in the second Ovid's simile poises the violence of the moment and of the image against the measured gravity of the verse in a way that Chaucer could not or did not wish to imitate. The mood is one of steadiness, almost (despite the 'shocking' image) of stateliness in the face of tragedy. Chaucer, by combining the three lines into one, achieves, with equally poetic effect, the softer, more nostalgic mood of regret.

The third instance to some extent reverses the process, for in it we find Gower adding what Ovid and Chaucer omit. The moment when Thisbe cowers in hiding while the lioness ranges around the pool is perhaps the most exciting in the story; yet it is one which Ovid does not stress at all, and Chaucer only in his own peculiar way. Gower senses this lack:

(Ovid) vidit, et obscurum timido pede fugit in antrum¹

(Gower) And Tisbe dorste not remue,
Bot as a bridde which were in Mue
Withinne a buish sche kepte hir clos.²

Whether the substitution of a bush for a cave is due to misrecollection does not matter, though it seems to me more likely to have been done consciously to preserve the consistency of his image. What is interesting is that Gower should feel the necessity at this point for heightened emotional effect, and should therefore insert the simile of the frightened bird—a simile commonplace but also eminently pathetic. Chaucer's reaction to Ovid is not altogether different, but his method is. Instead of elaboration he gives us compression. Seizing on the inconspicuous adjective *obscurum* he concentrates the emotion into one surprising verb:

And thus she sit and *darketh* wonder stille.³

Chaucer's version of the story is preferable to Gower's, not so much because he is closer to Ovid and altogether fuller, as by reason of his felicitous re-creations of individual words and lines. Since, however, the

¹ *Metamorphoses*, IV, 100.

² *Confessio Amantis*, III, 1412 ff.

³ *Legend of Good Women*, 816: the O. E. D. gives *Cursor Mundi* (1300) as providing the first example of the use of the word in this sense.

Legend as a whole is one of Chaucer's weaker pieces, and since in the story of 'Pyramus and Thisbe' Gower's relation to the original is not altogether certain, the comparison may seem hardly fair to either writer. Nevertheless if we set something finer of Chaucer's side by side with a passage in which Gower is incontestably translating Ovid the comparison still holds. The evocations of the famous 'House of Sleep' passage in the *Book of the Duchesse*¹ and the *Hous of Fame*² have fifteen and seven lines apiece. Gower, preserving all Ovid's detail and only adding a little of his own here and there, uses fifty.³ Even allowing for the greater compendiousness of the hexameter this is a surprising number for a passage of only fifteen lines in the original; yet, for all their apparent prolixity, or perhaps because of it, these fifty lines are a notable passage. They illustrate at once Gower's respect for what is obviously fine poetry, and the astonishing flow of his versification which can produce such delightful metrical effects as

. . . bot al aboute round
Ther is growende upon the ground
Popi, which berth the sed of slep.⁴

because it is quite unfettered. Compared with Gower's Chaucer's is only a faint imitation—no one but Spenser has approached the superb chiaroscuro of the original—but each passage contains one brilliantly transmuted line quite beyond Gower's reach. In the *Book of the Duchesse*

Save ther were a fewe welles
Came renning fro the clifles adoun
*That made a deedly sleping soun*⁵

is a conjuring of Ovid's

. . . per quem cum murmure labens
invitat somnos crepitantibus unda lapillis⁶

into a darker mood: and in the *Hous of Fame*

Ther slepeth ay this god unmerie
*With his slepy thousand sones*⁷

is a strange adaptation of the quite unimportant line (much later on in Ovid's version of the story)

at pater e populo natorum mille suorum.⁸

¹ *Book of the Duchesse*, 153 ff.

² *Hous of Fame*, 66 ff.

³ *Confessio Amantis*, IV, 2977-3023.

⁴ *Ibid.*, 3005 ff.

⁵ 160 ff. For reminiscences of Machaut in this passage see *Fonteinne Amoureuse* (ed. Hoepffner), 591 ff.

⁶ *Metamorphoses*, XI, 603 f.

⁷ 74 f.

⁸ *Metamorphoses*, XI, 633.

Nor is this all. Despite the virtues of Gower's rendering which make it at a first reading more attractive than Chaucer's, there is a strength in the latter which brings us back to his passages more than once, when we are content to let Gower remain a pleasant memory.

If we could tell why one line and not another evokes a response in Chaucer—'as why this fish and noght that cometh to were'—we should know a good deal more about the origins of great poetry in general. One is reminded of the kind of thing that happens frequently in Shakespeare; as when, for instance, Cintio's sordidly realistic account of the plot to kill Desdemona evokes Othello's 'marmoreal phrase',

Yet I'll not shed her blood
Nor scar that whiter skin of hers than snow,
And smooth as monumental alabaster . . .¹

As with Shakespeare, so with Chaucer, it is not necessarily the purple patches in the original which produce the most brilliant re-creations:² the virtuosity of the 'House of Sleep' passage has been the downfall of many a lesser poet,³ and even Spenser only achieved the effect he did by transferring Morpheus' house beneath a world of waters. We can, however, watch the process at work, though we cannot get at its origin. It is a process of attenuation and dilution. Only odd lines, phrases and words pieced together evoke the memory of the original. Yet it is not a weakening process. The piecing-together creates a new fabric, which has within it the strengthening support of the original if we can recognize it, and even if we cannot, has still a beauty of its own.

The original of Chaucer's descriptions of both the house of Fame and the house of Rumour is a passage of some fifteen lines in Ovid. A collation with the Latin produces interesting results. For lines 721-724 of the *House of Fame* four lines of Ovid are used (39-42); for ll. 843-847 Ovid ll. 39-40 are re-echoed (not repeated) and Ovid l. 43 brought in; for ll. 1025-1041 Ovid ll. 49-55 are used in the order 54 55, 49, 50, 51; for ll. 1945-1958 Ovid ll. 44-49 are used. Lines 1031-1041, with their alteration of

¹ *Othello*, v, ii. 3 ff. The passage from the *Hecatomithi* reads: '... the ensign said, "A method has occurred to me that would satisfy you without creating the least suspicion. The house where you live is very old, and the ceiling of your chamber is broken in many places. Desdemona might be beaten to death with a stocking full of sand, and no mark of this would remain on the body: when she is dead we will pull down a part of the ceiling, and bruise your wife's head: then give out that the beam in falling has done this, and killed her."' (Tr. W. Parr, 1795.)

² For instance, he makes no attempt to render Ovid's 'lullaby', *somme quies rerum placidissime somme deorum*: Gower too omits, but not, I think, for the same reason as Chaucer.

³ See the satire attributed to Sir John Roe: Donne, *Poetical Works*, ed. Grierson, vol. 1, Appendix B, p. 401.

Ovid's order, are an excellent example of how Chaucer achieves simultaneously the effect of his original and a personal piece of writing:

nec tamen est clamor, sed parvæ murmura vocis
qualia de pelagi siquis procul audiat undis
esse solent, qualemve sonum cum Iuppiter atras
inrepuuit nubes, extrema tonitrua reddunt.¹

Herestow not the grete swogh?
Yis, pardee, quod I, wel ynogh.
And what soun is it lik? quod he.
Peter, lik beting of the see,
Quod I, again the roches holowe,
Whan tempest doth the shippes swalowe,
And let a man stand out of doute
A mile thens and here it route;
Or elles lik the last humblinge
After the clappe of a thundringe
Whan Joves hath the air ybete.

Ovid, for all his compactness, still has the feeling of a far-off ominous whisper, achieved by elisions, syntax running counter to the metrical pattern, and above all by the muffled thump of his last syllable. Chaucer too gets the effect of distance, but his method is one of teasing-out: Ovid's ghostly thunder has been diffused throughout the longer passage, and different kinds of sound have been introduced, so that the whole is both a new creation and an invitation to recall the original. Once again, too, it is the unusual word (*tonitrua*) which catches Chaucer's fancy and produces the even more effective 'humblinge'.

Chaucer's husbanding of his material is surprising. From some fifteen lines of Ovid he creates four sizeable passages; about fifty lines in all of characteristic poetry—characteristic in its combination of lightness with a strength derived from a reference of graver tone. The deftness of allusion is above comment: never a direct rendering, yet the background clearly recognizable. The more we look at Chaucer's manipulation of the order of Ovid's lines the more certain it seems that he must have been so familiar with the passage that an imaginative reconstruction came to him without effort. Even more probable is it that he did not write with the text in front of him or from an *ad hoc* study such as is to be seen in his own 'Lucretia' and in so many of Gower's renderings. If a comparison of the two poets does nothing more, at least it illustrates the two kinds of borrowing: the one which steals, often (by a happy turn of phrase) gracefully; the other which pays back more than is borrowed and in which quotations are refreshed by the personality of the borrower.

Yet, although it is inevitable that Gower should have been used some-

¹ *Metamorphoses*, XII, 49-55.

what as a stalking-horse for the altogether more elusive Chaucer, the comparison does not belittle him. He has the good qualities of his limitations. When he follows Ovid he pays him the compliment of doing so carefully, only interpolating his own poetry where he feels it requisite to emphasize the emotion, and then often merely in a brief phrase, as when he says of Medea

Sche glod forth as an Addre doth.¹

He lacks Chaucer's allusive tact, and his literalness never creates the poetic effects of Chaucer's at its best. But he has pre-eminently the virtue of knowing what he is doing—a quality we must beware of underrating even when he seems at his most pedestrian. Indeed at times one is tempted to wonder whether he is not quietly pulling the reader's leg, when, after translating *verbenis silvaque incinxit agresti*²

Tho tok sche fieldwode and verveyne,³

he adds quite gratuitously

Of herbes ben noght betre tueine.⁴

If a joke it was, then it has succeeded, for editors dutifully emended to 'fieldwort'; and even now that the point has been taken no one calls attention to the implications of the succeeding line.

But if Gower's merits are enhanced by this kind of study, what shall we say of Chaucer's? When dealing with isolated lines and passages he is in a different class from Gower. But what of the claim,⁵ made in a work which is clearly important in the study of his literary background, that *Metamorphoses* is his chief and chosen reading? With a poet of Chaucer's kind and Chaucer's genius such a claim should be no light one: we should expect his greater poetry to be informed and moulded in some way by the spirit of Ovid. The rendering of a few tales (whether the *Legend* comes before or after the *Hous of Fame* is immaterial to the argument), two or three fine passages, and a number of incidental allusions (chiefly to *Heroides*) hardly fulfil such an expectation. It would do for Gower, and no doubt forms contributory evidence in Chaucer's case; but by the measure that Chaucer is a poet infinitely more subtle than Gower we should expect from him something subtler than a claim which could be made on behalf of Gower with equal or even greater truthfulness.

This is not the place to discuss the significance of the *Metamorphoses* in medieval literature, but this much may be allowable by way of general

¹ *Confessio Amantis*, v, 3967.

² *Metamorphoses*, vii, 242.

³ *Confessio Amantis*, v, 4039.

⁴ *Ibid.*, 4040.

⁵ 'And so thyn owne book hit telleth' (*Hous of Fame*, 712).

suggestion: that, as it is an anthropological work of more serious scope than is usually granted, dealing largely with myths of transformations in Nature wrought by the agency of sexual passion, it finds its proper place alongside such works as the *Pleynte of Kinde*.

Chaucer is much preoccupied with the medieval version of natural mysticism in so far as it concerns the various forms in which Love manifests itself. Therefore, I would suggest, that it is in this respect¹ that he calls Ovid 'Venus clerk', and stakes a special claim on the *Metamorphoses*. The influence is naturally implicit rather than overt, and often could only be called 'Ovidian' in the sense that it derives from a cognate author. The famous passage in the *Parlement*,² for instance, is largely from Alanus. But even here Ovid is not entirely absent—in fact, as one might expect, the two go hand in hand. At times, as in the lines on Proigne,

The swalwe Proigne with a sorwful lay
Whan morwe com gan make hir weymentinge,
Why she forshapen was; and ever lay
Pandare abedde, half in a slomeringe,
Til she so neigh him made hir chiteringe
How Tereus gan forth hir suster take,
That with the noyse of hir he gan awake . . .³

it flashes out quite openly. In the previous ('whyte bole') stanza chief attention is no doubt to be paid to the astrological reference and to the so-far unexplained 'Mayes day the thridde'. The parallel usually cited from the 'Nonne Preestes Tale' has the allusion simply to the sun in Taurus: Chantecler

Caste up his eyen to the brighte sonne
That in the signe of Taurus hadde y-ronne
Twenty degrees and oon and somewhat more,
And knew by kynde, and by noon other lore,
That it was pryme, and crew with blisful stevene,
The sonne, he sayde, is clomben up on hevene
Fourty degrees and oon, and more y-wis.
Madame Pertelote, my worldes blis,
Herkeneth thise blisful briddes how they singe,
And see the freshe floures how they springe;
Ful is myn herte of revel and solas . . .⁴

This has a spareness and detachment in keeping with the comedy, and yet retains just sufficient of other and quite different occasions on which

¹ And not exclusively as the author of the *Art Amoris*, which is the interpretation usually given to the phrase.

² *Parlement of Foules*, 316 *et seq.*: for Ovid see *ibid.*, 252 ff., and 271 ff.

³ *Troilus and Criseyde*, II, 64 ff.

⁴ *Canterbury Tales*, B. 4383 ff.

similar phraseology has been used to make it moving in ways other than comic as well. It serves as a useful *locus criticus* for the lines from *Troilus*:

In May that moder is of monthes glade
That fresshe floures blewe and whyte and rede
Ben quik agayn, that winter dede made,
And ful of bawme is fleting every mede;
Whan Phebus doth his brighte bemes sprede
Right in the whyte Bole, it so betidde,
As I shal singe, on Mayes day the thridde . . .¹

Here the sensuous appeal is unmistakable. The liquid quality of

And ful of bawme is fleting every mede

and of the verse as a whole, together with the imagery, suggests something more than a conventional reference to the 'May' theme: for me (perhaps I am too easily suggestible) it echoes the tone of the 'Europa' passage in Ovid, with its fresh grass and frequent garlands:

induitur faciem tauri mixtusque iuvenis
mugit et in teneris formosus obambulat herbis.
quippe color nivis est, quam nec vestigia duri
calcare pedes, nec solvit aquaticus Auster &c.²

At least it may be said that Chaucer has gone out of his way to point the allusion by altering the more usual 'Taurus' so as to recall the lines from Ovid; and both passages employ imagery of a similar kind. Hints, however, are not often as plain as this. For the most part what I have been trying to trace is a 'covered qualitee', showing its finest effects when expressed obliquely:

O blisful light, of whiche the bemes clere
Adorneth al the thridde hevene faire.
O sonnes leef, o Joves doughter dere,
Plesaunce of love, o goodly debonaire.
In gentil hertes ay redy to repaire.
O verray cause of hele and of gladnesse,
Yheried be thy might and thy goodnesse.

In hevene and helle, in erthe and salte see
Is felt thy might, if that I wel discerne;
As man, brid, best, fish, herbe and grene tree
Thee fele in tymes with vapour eterne.
God loveth; and to love wol nought werne;
And in this world no lyves creature
Withouten love is worth or may endure.

¹ *Troilus and Criseyde*, II, 50 ff.

² *Metamorphoses*, II, 852 ff.

Ye Joves first to thilke effectes glade,
Thorough which that thinges liven alle and be,
Comeveden, and amorous him made
On mortal thing, and as yow list ay ye
Yeve him in love ese or adversitee;
And in a thousand formes doun him sente
For love in erthe, and whom yow list he hente.¹

Such a passage seems to me typical of the influence of the *Metamorphoses* in Chaucer. If it is so it may explain the greater weight and seriousness to be found in his moralizations of love than in the poems of his contemporaries.

¹ *Troilus and Criseyde*, III, 1 ff.

THE STRUCTURAL EXPERIMENT IN *HAMLET*

By J. M. NOSWORTHY

Shakespeare was by no means a slave to conventional play construction, and even if one takes the most liberal view there still remain several plays in which he courts structural disaster only to achieve felicitous success. The narrowly averted breakdown in *The Winter's Tale* is, perhaps, the most extreme example. The sequence and unity of *Hamlet* are so complete and natural that the reader seldom pauses to consider how very nearly Shakespeare approaches, and avoids, utter chaos by presenting his material in the way that he does. A fellowship of strolling players arrive by chance at Elsinore, and virtually assume control for nearly six hundred lines. They gossip, rehearse, connive, are tutored, and eventually act. They stimulate Hamlet to enthusiasm, criticism, and soliloquy. They serve to bring the tragedy of *Hamlet* to a climax, but it is a false climax, and then disappear as suddenly as Lear's Fool, having impeded the action of the play and contributed simply one important piece of evidence to Hamlet's suspicions. It seems a small return for their prolonged presence, and one which could certainly have been obtained with considerably more economy. A brief analysis of the scenes under review will shew just how seemingly irrelevant most of this business with the players is:

- II. ii. 1. Rosencrantz's announcement of the arrival of the players.
- 2. Hamlet's questions about the contemporary theatre.
- 3. Hamlet's reception of the players.
- 4. The dramatic reminiscences of Polonius.
- 5. The retrospective recitation of Æneas's tale to Dido.
- 6. Hamlet's soliloquy directly inspired by 5.
(Act III, Scene 1, belongs to the main action of the play.)
- III. ii. 7. Hamlet's instructions to the players.
- 8. Hamlet's revelation of his plan to Horatio.
- 9. The play scene.

Of these, only the last two and the part of 5 in which Hamlet unfolds his plan to the First Player are strictly necessary. There is probably adequate æsthetic and psychological justification for the rest, but the present purpose is to shew that Shakespeare was here embarking on a curious and quite deliberate structural experiment.

The play within a play is an 'interlude' in the strict sense. Hamlet's instructions to the players, and his earlier dramatic commentary can, I

think, be equally strictly classified as 'induction'. The player scenes may be sub-divided thus:—

1. The Induction.
2. The Interlude.
3. The Recital (The *Æneas* speech). This might be treated as either Induction or Interlude. It partakes of both, and is neither. It can, perhaps, most conveniently be regarded as the link between 1 and 2.

Both Induction and Interlude were fairly popular dramatic devices at the time when *Hamlet* was written, but the former came, of course, at the start of a play, and the latter usually at the end. Shakespeare's experiment was to juxtapose them at a most unexpected point, virtually in the middle of a play.

The Induction: Shakespeare made little use of the formal induction. *The Taming of the Shrew* is still too much a subject of controversy to claim any authority for Shakespearean precedent, and the induction to this early play, surely no more than a time-filling expedient, has really very little in common with the inductions to plays written round about 1600. If we compare one or two representative inductions from that time, e.g. those to *Antonio and Mellida*, *The Malcontent*, *Everyman Out of His Humour*, and *Cynthia's Revels*, with the fairy-tale, wish-fulfilment theme of Christopher Sly's metamorphosis, we recognize at once a change of purpose and a narrowing of scope. The new induction is a kind of gossip column of candidly satirical, or, at least, *partiisan*, intent. It comments freely on plays and players, censures opposition, airs grievances, and expounds doctrine. In short it is a polemic medium for the jarring belligerents of the War of the Theatres, and owes its prominence to those hostilities. It would be too much to expect the gentle Shakespeare, who shews himself to be truly gentle in the displaced *Hamlet* 'induction', to start off any play, and least of all a major tragedy, with a scurrilous diatribe in the manner of Jonson or Marston. Yet the matter and style of what I term the Induction scenes in *Hamlet* do not differ in kind from those of the inductions cited. There is a difference in degree, of course: Shakespeare was a non-belligerent. But his topics—the deplorable temporary supremacy of the boy actors, the current battle of the dramatists, the defence of actors as 'the abstracts and brief chronicles of the time', the eloquent plea for a sincere and exalted standard of dramatic representation—are in line with the practice of Jonson, Marston, and others. Moreover, these topics are presented not in a free, dramatic way, but in the stilted manner of the formal induction, starting with a catechism (II. ii. 315-46) and ending with a dogmatic and

exhaustive exposition of doctrine (III. ii. 1-44), and Shakespeare captures the witty, allusive, and cryptic utterance of his more formal fellows.

The correspondence does not end here, and clearly, if we accept the *Hamlet* scenes as a scattered induction, we should attempt to relate them more closely to the other inductions, for the chances are that they are less a satirical commentary, as is generally supposed, than a temperate rejoinder. Viewed in this light, certain of Shakespeare's allusions do, indeed, seem a little clearer.

(a) . . . but there is sir an acry of children, little eyases, that cry out on the top of question; and are most tyrannically clapp'd for't: these are now the fashion, and so berattle the common Stages (so they call them) that many wearing rapiers, are afraid of goosequills, and dare scarce come thither.

A link can be attempted, but not established, with the inductions to *Cynthia's Revels* and *The Malcontent*. Jonson's eyases berattle the common stages (and so they call them) thus:

Besides, they could wish your poets would leave to be promoters of other men's jests. . . . That they would not so penuriously glean wit from every laundress or hackney-man, or derive their best grace, with servile imitation, from common stages, or observation of the company they converse with.

The discomfiture of the gallants wearing rapiers may be an allusion to the stir caused by a pretty specimen of Marstonian bile:

for as nowadays, no courtier but has his mistress, no captain but has his cockatrice, no cuckold but has his hornes, and no fool but has his feather.

(*Malcontent* v. ii.)

The non-Marstonian induction added to *The Malcontent* when the King's Players filched and acted it in 1604 strengthens this link. There, Sly, who represents one of the gallants, maintains that 'this play is a bitter play' and says:

Why, do you think I'll have jests broken upon me in the play to be laugh'd at? This play hath beaten all your gallants out of the feathers: Blackfriars hath almost spoil'd Blackfriars for feathers.

Some connexion between the goosequills and the feathers is likely enough, even if Shakespeare only intended a secondary pun. It would, of course, be a gibe, not a rejoinder. Rosencrantz's use of the affected adverb, 'tyrannically', has a Marstonian precedent in *Antonio's Revenge* v. iii, where the affected Balurdo says:

Nay, and you talk of revenge, my stomach's up, for I am most tyrannically hungry.

(b) *Hamlet*: Do the Boys carry it away?

Rosencrantz: Ay that they do my Lord, Hercules and his load too.

The Globe Theatre sign, shewing Hercules shouldering the world, and bearing the device *Totus mundus agit histrionem*, was often alluded to, by

Shakespeare and others, in plays written for the company. Marston, in the induction to *Antonio and Mellida*, has three veiled but likely gibes at the Globe, its sign and motto:—

- Alberto:* Oho: then thus frame your exterior shape,
To haughty form of elate majesty;
As if you held the palsy-shaking head
Of reeling chance, under your fortune's belt
In strictest vassalage: grow big in thought,
As swoll'n with glory of successful arms.
- Piero:* If that be all, fear not, I'll suit it right.
Who cannot be proud, stroke up the hair, and strut?
- Alberto:* Truth: such rank custom is grown popular;
And now the vulgar fashion strides as wide,
And stalks as proud upon the weakest stilts
Of the slight'st fortunes, as if Hercules
Or burly Atlas shoulder'd up their state.

Galeatzo: Well, and what dost thou play?

Balardo: The part of all the world.

Alberto: The part of all the world? What's that?

Balardo: The fool.

Alberto: . . . Nay if you cannot bear two subtle fronts under one hood,
Idiot go by, go by; off this world's stage! Oh time's impurity!

The first of these ostensibly implies that the Globe actors, in particular, are guilty of exaggerated action, and the second will at least bear the interpretation that excessive clowning is one of their delinquencies. The allegations are warranted, but Shakespeare is not disposed to yield the point openly to Marston. He contents himself with an allusion to 'Hercules and his load', and discreetly proceeds with the recital, the soliloquy and a court scene before virtually admitting the justice of Marston's strictures in Hamlet's advice to the players.

The first part of the 'induction' has been mainly defensive. It glances now at Marston, now at Jonson, and comments on the 'little eyases', but its primary purpose is to rebut certain allegations publicly, and to maintain that the endeavour of the players 'keeps in the wonted pace'. The second part attacks, urbanely but forcefully, the Chamberlain's men themselves. Marston's verb 'strut' is echoed, and the charges of over-acting and obtrusive clowning are scrutinized, admitted, and deplored. Shakespeare adopts a parental attitude. After protesting the innocence of his child, he turns to administer correction, behind closed doors as it were.¹ But he is

¹ Shakespeare's dissatisfaction was reasonable, but the bombast and intrusive clowning were inevitable. The temporary supremacy of the children had robbed the Globe of its more discriminating patrons, so that it became increasingly necessary to pander to the groundlings. Shakespeare makes his attitude to the approbation of the illiterate quite clear: the censure of one of the judicious must 'o'erweigh a whole theatre of others'.

not the first dramatist to assume this attitude. Hamlet's advice to the players is a sort of pendant to Jonson's plea for the reform of dramatic endeavours in the induction to *Cynthia's Revels*.

The present purpose is to suggest that these scenes constitute an induction informally presented, and any attempt to relate them more exactly to the War of the Theatres is neither here nor there. Nevertheless, this 'induction' shews Shakespeare playing the belligerents at their own game, but with marked forbearance in the face of considerable provocation.¹ Attacks directed against his company are met with a light, nonchalant banter, and what elements of apparent truth are in them are scrutinized and applied. Shakespeare remains a person of gentle habits, and the mind that dismisses what is ephemeral in the players' strife and its consequences, and seeks to amend the residue, is contemplative and self-critical, with no censorious or dogmatic bent.

The Interlude: It has been suggested that the 'induction' was Shakespeare's adaptation of a device popular at the time when *Hamlet* was written. The same might be argued of the interlude, but the general tendency by 1600 seems to have been to prefer the masque to the inner play for this purpose. In *Antonio's Revenge*, a tragedy strikingly analagous to *Hamlet*, Marston employs a masquing interlude as his catastrophic medium, and Jonson follows suit in *Cynthia's Revels*. A masque would have been quite unsuitable for Shakespeare's, and Hamlet's, purpose, but in selecting the play within a play he may have been following the earlier *Hamlet*. Kyd's *Spanish Tragedy* supplies classic instance of the use of an inner play as a means of bringing about the catastrophe of the main drama. Shakespeare's interlude, however, is an instrument that brings all the important characters on to the stage at the same time, and the play scene simulates a catastasis but effects no catastrophe.

The play used by Shakespeare as the model for *Hamlet* is usually assumed to have been written, round about 1589, by Thomas Kyd. Whether this was so or not scarcely affects the perfectly valid inferences that can be drawn concerning the scope and pattern of the play. *The Spanish Tragedy* remained the standard model for revenge tragedy for a

¹ A few months later, in *The Return from Parnassus*, Shakespeare was represented as Jonson's final and irresistible antagonist, but this is a single, unsupported testimony. It was Dekker who, in *Satiromastix* gave Jonson the purge 'that made him bewray his credit'. But Shakespeare probably acted in *Satiromastix*, thus administering the 'purge' as an actor, not as a playwright. Kemp, in *The Return from Parnassus*, emphasizes 'our fellow Shakespeare', which suggests the player rather than the poet.

On the whole, especially in the light of Jonson's later utterances, one would expect to find Shakespeare siding with him rather than with Marston who was, in the narrow sense, a competitor. The similarity of *Hamlet* and *Antonio's Revenge* was probably no great persuasion to mutual good will. But no evidence exists, and the *Hamlet* 'induction' is neutral.

number of years, and the odds are that a *Hamlet* composed in 1589 followed it closely, even slavishly. Marlowe might have handled such a theme in his own way, but one doubts whether any other known dramatist was sufficiently independent to deviate from the Kydian norm, and whether Kyd himself would not have elected to repeat the success of *The Spanish Tragedy* rather than risk failure by treating the Hamlet story in a new way. Such an argument has its limitations, but when it is found that *Hamlet* and *The Spanish Tragedy* have elements in common—the Ghost, the interlude, and the hero's procrastination, for instance—it seems more reasonable to assume that those elements were present in the early, Kydian *Hamlet*, Shakespeare's source, than that Shakespeare derived them from a play which was now openly ridiculed and burlesqued by the new school of dramatists.

'The Murder of Gonzago', then, or something very much like it, stood in the earlier *Hamlet*, but it is hard to believe that it there served the subtle purpose that it does in Shakespeare's tragedy. For Kyd or his imitator, the Ghost's revelation would probably have been sufficient to incriminate the King, and though Kyd himself was not lacking in psychological insight, it is extremely doubtful whether he would have framed this elaborate device simply to confirm suspicions already well grounded. His psychology was accidental, and action was paramount in the Senecan type of revenge tragedy that he affected, whereas Shakespeare's version of the interlude is a contribution to thought rather than to action. In a Kydian *Hamlet*, therefore, we should expect the interlude to be vital to the main action, and if so, its place would almost certainly be at the end of the play, and not in the middle.

In *The Spanish Tragedy* the inner play of 'Soliman and Perseda' is performed not by a group of strolling players but by the main characters, and serves to bring about the catastrophe. A Kydian version of 'The Murder of Gonzago' would follow much the same lines, and the purpose would be to effect the revenge, not to reproduce the circumstances of the elder Hamlet's death. This would involve Claudius as Gonzago, Gertrude as Baptista, and Hamlet as Lucianus, and the denouement would be complete as soon as it was revealed that Hamlet did not 'poison in jest' but in earnest. The strange thing is that even in Shakespeare's version Lucianus is 'nephew to the King'. This is the Hamlet-Claudius, not the Claudius-elder Hamlet, relationship, and it is a notable inconsistency in Shakespeare's reproduction of the circumstances described by the Ghost. The simplest explanation is that it stood thus in the source play, and that Shakespeare incorporated it rather carelessly, for, as it stands, it is scarcely calculated to 'catch the conscience of the King'. Professor Dover Wilson's suggestion that, in the play scene, the stage is set for the assassination of

Claudius is probably very near the truth.¹ That this was so in the earlier *Hamlet*, and that the assassination did, in fact, take place there and then is, on the whole, more likely than not. Shakespeare may, at first, have decided to follow suit. He crowds his stage and builds up his climax, and then disdains the method. There are many possible reasons. For one thing, denouement by interlude, in so far as it resembled *The Spanish Tragedy*, would court ridicule, and in so far as it resembled the deplorable ending of *Antonio's Revenge* would be redundant and inartistic.² Shakespeare turned a potential liability very much to his own advantage by giving the interlude a new place and purpose, with refinements and subtleties hitherto unexplored.

The earlier player scenes are just as much an induction as the so-styled efforts of Shakespeare's contemporaries, but it is an induction displaced and dispersed for Shakespeare's own good reasons. To have appended a formal induction to such a tragedy as *Hamlet* would have been palpably absurd on purely artistic grounds, and though the acrimonious excesses of the War of the Theatres may have tempted him to such a course, he doubtless realized that his relatively objective comments would be strengthened by oblique presentation. The decision to use the interlude medially and divert its purpose provided him with a convenient fellowship of players and an unexpected opportunity for airing his views, so that this particular form of induction probably evolved from that particular form of interlude, and both had necessarily to be fitted in during the players' brief sojourn at Elsinore. The two extremities of standard drama are welded and presented medially, with a just sufficient dependence on the main plot. It is a bold and revolutionary structural experiment, and, as it stands, an amazing *tour-de-force*.

¹ Cf. *Hamlet*, ed. J. Dover Wilson ('The New Shakespeare' edition). Note to III.ii. 248.

² Jonson had already lashed *The Spanish Tragedy*. Marston had sneered at 'these musty fopperies of antiquity', though he did not disdain to make full use of them. Shakespeare ran a certain risk when he embarked on *Hamlet*, and, of the later tragedies, *Macbeth* and *King Lear* were hazardous.

THE PHALARIS CONTROVERSY: KING *VERSUS* BENTLEY

By COLIN J. HORNE

According to 'the Town and common Fame' the Christ Church men had an immediate victory in their dispute with Bentley over the Letters of Phalaris. This temporary, and in many respects unworthy, triumph of theirs was mainly due to their vigorous raillery and ready wit, and not at all to any superiority of scholarship on their part.

The name of Dr. William King is often omitted from the number of these Christ Church wits, yet it was his flair for banter and parody and his fertility in devising new forms of controversial wit that gave much of its unjust advantage to the Christ Church side.

Previously a King's Scholar of Westminster, William King graduated from Christ Church as D.C.L. in 1692, and thereafter during several years spent much of his time in London as an Advocate of Doctors' Commons. Already at Oxford he had gained some reputation as a controversialist, and in London he found further scope for his talents, receiving, in particular, much applause for his *Animadversions on a Pretended Account of Denmark* (1694), in reply to Robert Molesworth's advocacy of Whig principles. It was while he was seeing this book through the press that he made the chance acquaintance of Bentley in circumstances that were to affect not only his own relations with the scholar but the whole tenor of the Phalaris dispute.

About April 1694, King called at the shop of the bookseller Thomas Bennet, who was publishing his *Animadversions*.¹ There he witnessed what he frequently referred to later as the pride and insolence of the King's Librarian, the office to which Bentley was about to be appointed at the time King met him. Bentley was making difficulties about lending the Library's MS. of the Letters of Phalaris, which the young Charles Boyle had asked the bookseller to collate for his forthcoming edition, even going so far as to assert 'That after the Various Lectons were once taken, and printed, the MS. would be like a squeez'd Orange, and little worth for the future'. At this point King interposed, as any scholar might,

¹ *A Short Account of Dr. Bentley's Humanity and Justice*, London, 1699, pp. 107-8.

to protest 'that a MS. was worth nothing unless it were Collated'.¹ King no doubt reported this encounter to his friends at Oxford and there the matter ended for a time, so far as he was concerned, though he was annoyed by Bentley's insolent manner and his discourtesy towards one of the most promising young members (and a nobleman at that) of King's own college. Indeed all the members of Christ Church considered that the college had been affronted by Bentley's surly treatment of Boyle's request, and from this display of bad manners arose the prolonged and notorious dispute between Bentley and the wits of that college.

The ensuing stages of the controversy are well known. Only the briefest summary will be required here to carry the story on to the point of King's further intervention. In the preface to Boyle's edition of the Letters (January 1695) the editor, influenced partly by King's account of his meeting with Bentley, commented rather acidly on the behaviour of the King's Librarian about the MS., and henceforth Bentley's 'singular humanity' became the battle-cry of the offended Christ Church men. King particularly relished the jibe. Though not loath to accept their challenge, Bentley withheld his answer and counter-attack for two years, and when at last his *Dissertation upon the Epistles of Phalaris*, etc. appeared in 1697, it was in all truth damning enough. Nor from the moment it appeared could there be any further doubt that the Letters of Phalaris were spurious, and his Christ Church opponents never seriously tried to refute his main conclusions. They were nevertheless far from abandoning the contest to which Bentley had now added the provocation of humiliating censure on the methods and merits of Christ Church scholarship, and all their forces were gathered against him.

Their reply was *Dr. Bentley's Dissertations on the Epistles of Phalaris, and the Fables of Æsop, Examined by the Honourable Charles Boyle, Esq.*, 1698.² For this Examination King had been called upon by a friend of Boyle as 'a Gentleman of known Credit in the World' to contribute his version of the encounter with Bentley at Bennet's shop in 1694.³ This

¹ King's second letter to Boyle, *A Short Account*, etc., p. 136.

² Usually known as 'Boyle on Bentley', the book was in fact the composite work of the 'Christ Church bees', Atterbury, Smalbridge, King, Alsop and the two brothers Freind, organized by Atterbury, who himself wrote at least half the book (*Epistolary Correspondence of Bishop Atterbury*, 1787, vol. II, p. 21). Boyle had little part in it and seems at this stage to have conceived a distaste for the whole affair. In one Bodleian copy of *Boyle on Bentley* (Radcliffe c. 100) the following note by the poet Richard Duke, chaplain to the Bishop of Winchester, is entered in MS.: 'According to his letter (sent with the first Edition of this book) to the Bishop of Exeter, now Bishop of Winchester, which the Bishop communicated to me, so much of this book as is here specified was written by Dr. Atterbury, viz. from the Title page to page 60, from p. 90 to p. 112, from p. 133 to p. 184, from p. 215 to p. 230. And almost all the examination of the Dissertation upon the Fables of Æsop. Richard Duke.'

³ *Boyle on Bentley*, p. 8, letter from King to Boyle from Doctors' Commons, dated 13 October, 1697.

friend was certainly Atterbury, who was a contemporary of King at Christ Church and a close acquaintance. It must likewise have been Atterbury who invited King to contribute to the book in other ways, an invitation that appealed to him in every respect. If the reply vanquished Bentley, as it was held to have done at the time, it must have been solely by the energy and brilliance of its wit, and for this King must receive the major honours. The most ingenious section, and, as Bentley's biographer Monk says,¹ the part that fairly deserves the palm, is that between pages 184 and 201, which adapts Bentley's methods of disproving Phalaris's authorship of the Letters to a burlesque demonstration that Bentley could not have written his own Dissertation. Warburton has recorded that Pope had heard from Atterbury at a later time that King wrote this section.² In a note to the 1777 edition of Bentley's *Dissertation*, Dr. Salter, who knew Bentley personally, asserts that Smalridge was the author.³ Salter's view is accepted by Monk,⁴ who rejects Pope's evidence on the very slender grounds that Atterbury 'was not likely ever to have discussed with him a subject, which supplied only mortifying recollections', and adds that 'the tone of the parody is somewhat different, and the taste unlike that of King's banter'. But *pace* Monk, the manner and the method of this bantering parody are exactly those of King as they appear, for example, in his mockery of Dr. Lister in that same year. Bentley was shrewder than his biographer in recognizing that the parody of Lister's *Journey to Paris* in the burlesque *Journey to London* (1698) was by the same hand as had already treated him in similar fashion. I have no doubt that both were the work of King.

The method of the parody in *Boyle on Bentley* is, briefly, to take passages from Bentley and by shifting the emphasis, or making other slight alterations in them, to make him stand condemned or ridiculed by his very own words. It was a trick of controversy that King made distinctively his own. Earlier, he had used it with some success in his book against Molesworth and he continued to employ it with the utmost skill in his later controversial writings, though never more damagingly than here. In a form which can best be termed, in a phrase of his own, 'mock-Bentley', he represents later critics arguing 'in Dr. Bentley's Way and Manner, and for the most Part in his very Words too, . . . against their [i.e. Bentley's Dissertations] being truly his to whom they are ascrib'd' (p. 184). Often his method requires no more than the change of an occasional word or phrase in the passage he transfers from Bentley. At other

¹ J. H. Monk, *Life of Richard Bentley, D.D.*, 1830, p. 81 and note.

² *Letters from an Eminent Prelate*, 1809, p. 11.

³ P. 309.

⁴ *Op cit.*, p. 81.

times, of course, he cannot follow the original so literally, but such is then his sharpness in finding happy parallels that at once recall and ridicule the original, that the method can only be fairly illustrated by the quotation of parallel passages, such as the following :

BENTLEY (pp. 40-1)

Had all other ways fail'd us of detecting this Impostor, yet his very Speech had betray'd him. For his Language is *Attic*, the beloved Dialect of the Sophists, in which all their *Medæras*, or *Exercises*, were composed ; in which they affected to excell each other, even to Pedantry and Solecism. But he had forgot that the Scene of these Epistles was not *Athens*, but *Sicily*, where the *Doric* tongue was generally spoken and written ; as besides the testimonies of others, the very Thing speaks it self in the Remains of *Sicilian* Authors, *Sophron*, *Epicharmus*, *Stesichorus*, *Theocritus*, *Moschus*, and others. How comes it to pass then, that our Tyrant transacts every thing in *Attic*, not only foreign Affairs of State, but domestic Matters with *Sicilian* Friends, but the very Accounts of his Houshold ? Pray, how came that Idiom to be the Court Language at Agrigentum ?

KING (pp. 185-6)

'Had all other ways fail'd us of detecting this Impostor, yet his very *Speech* had betray'd him, for it is neither that 'of a Scholar, nor an *Englishman* ; 'neither Greek, Latin, nor English, 'but a Medley of all Three: He had 'forgot that the Scene of these Writings 'was *London*, where the English 'Tongue was generally spoken and 'written ; as, besides other Testimonies, the very thing speaks it self 'in the Remains of *London* Authors, as 'the *Gazetts*, the *Cases* written by '*London* Divines, and others. How 'comes it to pass then that our Dr 'writes not in English, but in a 'Language farther remov'd from the 'true English Idiom than the *Doric* 'Greek was from the *Attic*?' [King here comes out of quotation marks to accuse Bentley of writing 'a New 'Language, which no Englishman before ever wrote, or spoke'.] 'Pray, how 'came that Idiom to be the Court-'language at St. James's?'

King proceeds to point out a more general resemblance between Bentley's dogmatic handling of his case and the arbitrary tyrannical methods of Phalaris himself. The suggestion for this particular piece of banter had in fact been provided by Bentley when he declared that the calumnies in Boyle's Preface resembled both the injustice of the tyrant Phalaris and the forgery of the Sophist who wrote his Letters. Certainly Bentley was most open to censure for his arrogant ways in controversy ; and he was himself so far conscious of this that the sting he seems to have borne longest in mind was King's reference to his pride and insolence. Further King does not go. Above all he was too shrewd to attempt the impossible by challenging Bentley's conclusions about the spuriousness of the Epistles, though elsewhere in the book efforts are made by other hands to find fault with the evidence Bentley adduces. On this occasion, at any rate, King was ready to leave these less fruitful criticisms to others.

Bentley, on his part, was sensible that King's contributions to the book had done him the greatest harm in contemporary opinion by the exulting banter with which they assailed him. It is not perhaps a fair method for supposedly scholarly dispute, but Bentley had not been over-careful to confine himself to matters of scholarship, and the contemporary audience undoubtedly sought more for entertainment than enlightenment in the quarrel. In providing this, King was an adept; the only defect of his method for the not very serious reader is that a full enjoyment of his detailed mimicking demands an equally detailed knowledge of the work that is intended for its butt, which of course any one genuinely interested in this particular controversy would have, or would be willing to acquire. When he used the device again in later disputes, with less eminent opponents, the effect was often to give undue prominence to the details of a pamphlet that would otherwise have left nothing but a brief and general impression on the reader.

In all King's writing of this type there is a plain and convincing directness of style, which perhaps owed something to his practice as an advocate and judge; it gives to his work a fresh and personal interest, even when the subject is too trivial to be particularly interesting in itself, and it qualifies him to speak on faults of style in others. Like his contemporary Swift, he was a purist in style and diction. For example, in the passage that has been quoted above he takes exception to the uncouth medley of diction used by Bentley, further stigmatizing it as pedantic and 'familiar', colloquial and dialectal. It pleases King to attribute this to the mixture of country breeding and insolent pretension in Bentley, though a reader less eager to find fault may well enjoy such vigorous expressions, like many in Milton's prose pamphlets, for the note of personal intensity they give to Bentley's arguments. Yet in the main King was right. There is usually in Bentley's style a stiffness and lack of elegance that suggest the boor rather than the scholar or gentleman, and amply justify King's criticism.

To the second edition of *Boyle on Bentley*, which appeared in the same year, 1698, was added a satirical index under the heading of 'A Short Account of Dr. Bentley, by way of Index'.¹ It again appears incongruous to the modern reader to find this sarcastic list of all Bentley's alleged failings gathered together, with page references, as the index to a book that after all professed to be part of a learned controversy. But one must not forget that the whole dispute was a very mixed business, in which, among other things, King was expected to be the shrewd jester. Pope

¹ According to A. T. Bartholomew, *Richard Bentley, D.D. A Bibliography*, p. 29, it is frequently found in copies of the first edition also, though I have not met with any examples.

told Warburton that this index also was the work of King, and a similar satirical use of the index in some of his later writings (viz. *A Journey to London*, *The Transactioneer*, and *Useful Transactions in Philosophy*, etc.) leaves us with no doubt that Pope's statement was correct. Used against Bentley, this novel satirical device¹ must have seemed to his detractors particularly appropriate to the scholar whom they had so often sarcastically praised for his skill in consulting indexes. On this occasion, they were pleased to think, the consultation would provide him with little enjoyment though with much salutary instruction on the subject of his own defects of learning, taste and character.

It would have been most unlike Bentley to suffer these various insults and injuries in silence. In his most learned revision and enlargement of the *Dissertation*, the second edition published in 1699 independently of Wotton's *Reflections*, he flogs his detractors at Christ Church with wit as well as learning. He could allow that there was much talent shown in the humorous passages of *Boyle on Bentley*, at the same time reminding the reader that it was no more than a talent for farce and grimace, with no relevance to the truth, learning and judgment that he could justly claim for his own book. Throughout this expanded reply his most acrimonious remarks are directed at King: obviously he knew that King had contributed to *Boyle on Bentley* more than the one short letter printed over his name. His comment that the burlesque section 'seems rather to have been writ in a Tavern than in a Study' is fairly certainly a jibe at the well-known conviviality of King, whose intimate knowledge of tavern life had provided much material for his *Journey to London*, and to that book Bentley's attention had been drawn by its further allusions to his 'singular Humanity'. King had there given a long and curious list of the ales procurable in London taverns, and now singling out the most strangely named of these, Bentley slightly dubbing him 'the Humty Dumty Author'. But this Humty Dumty was not to be knocked off his wall so easily. Merry fellow as he was, King was sensitive about his character (for he was, after all, an Advocate of Doctors' Commons), so that his enmity towards Bentley was intensified by this personal affront.

The long and mostly absurd continuance of the controversy gave him sufficient opportunity to return the insult of Bentley's 'awkward Jests' and 'impertinent Quotations'. It was considered that Bentley's remarks on Phalaris had been sufficiently well dealt with, so the captious criticism

¹ As early as 1633 Prynne had employed the index of his *Histrion-Mastix* to give a list of opinions contained in the book as distinct from facts, but this index to *Boyle on Bentley* seems to be the first invasion of satire into that part of a book, for which reason Isaac D'Israeli called King the inventor of the satirical index. See H. B. Wheatley, *How to Make an Index*, 1902, p. 35.

was now extended to some of his other classical studies, in an anonymous volume whose title, *A Short Account of Dr. Bentley's Humanity and Justice* (1699), indicates the nature of its bias. This book had already been written and the sheets printed before the appearance of Bentley's enlarged *Dissertation*. When he forestalled it with this defence of himself, it was considered necessary to add a Postscript explaining that, although there was no doubt of Bentley's learning and industry, his good temper and sincerity still remained open to question. This was followed by an Appendix, purporting to be written by the bookseller Bennet, in which he restated the treatment he had received over the Phalaris MS., a grievance that now, five years later, might well have been allowed to drop.¹ It is possible that this Appendix, which contains a further letter from King to Boyle on the subject of his first encounter with Bentley, was entirely written by King. Nichols inclined to think so and Monk agreed with him,² and it seems very likely, from their particular flavour, that the witty elements were supplied by King as well as the Letter to Boyle. Actually this letter was written not to Boyle but to Atterbury,³ and the inference is that once again, as with *Boyle on Bentley*, Atterbury was chiefly responsible for the book, in compiling which he had received considerable help from King, especially with the Appendix.

Encouraged by the success of his piece of burlesque in *Boyle on Bentley*, King now dropped all pretence of a scholarly interchange for that personal satire, or rather burlesque, in which he was conscious of his own skill and popular success. His *Dialogues of the Dead*, which also appeared in 1699, were written, King claims, in self-defence.⁴ Yet the so-called self-defence was but another personal offensive against 'the Snarling Critick' Bentivoglio, a nick-name which henceforth stuck to Bentley. This use of imaginary conversations among the spirits of the great departed was a novel weapon in the armoury of English satire, apparently first used in this country by King for the purpose of lampooning Bentley. Unlike Fontenelle and Fénelon in France, and later Lyttelton and Hurd in England, all of whom used the form for serious and didactic moral discourse, King went straight back to the practice of Lucian, the

¹ The sheets of the *Short Account* were already printed by the beginning of 1699, though publication must have been delayed until after the appearance of Bentley's enlarged *Dissertation* in March. That publication was purposely held up until Bentley should bring out his book is made clear by [S. Whateley?] in the preface to *An Answer to a late Book Written against the Learned and Reverend Dr. Bentley*, 1699, and by the fact that both the *Dissertation* and the *Short Account* (with Appendix) were advertised at the same time in the Term Catalogue for February, 1699.

² *The Original Works of William King*, ed. J. Nichols, 1776, vol. I, p. 140. Monk, *op. cit.*, p. 100.

³ *Epistolary Correspondence*, vol. IV, p. 337, Letter CVIII.

⁴ King, *Miscellanies in Prose and Verse* [1709], Preface.

originator of the form, in using it primarily for satire on the vanity of human pretensions, with special reference to particular examples. Bentivoglio is thus delineated by King with much the same personal malice as lay behind 'the Syrian's frontless buffoonery'. Bentley is not himself consigned untimely to the underworld, but the advent of his works there is made the occasion of disputes among the shades of men, some fictitious, but most of them with some claim of their own to fame or notoriety. These shades converse on terms of equality, and with much plain-speaking, and only those who won a name on earth as the worst and dullest of critics have anything to say in favour of the despised Bentivoglio. In this way one character in a dialogue is usually made a butt for the wit of some other character, who banters him in King's own manner for his support of Bentley. The banter is often a burlesque imitation of Bentley's critical methods, with the usual plunder and misapplication of quotations from him. This method and the parody of the worst features of Bentley's style—proverbs used as often as occasion can be found for them, 'and oftener', his neologisms and idiosyncrasies in spelling—complete the evidence that the similar passage in *Boyle on Bentley* was the work of King.

King was not wise enough here, as he had been previously, to admit tacitly that Bentley's findings on the authorship of the Epistles were right. On the contrary he represents the Sophist to whom Bentley had transferred the authorship arrogantly priding himself on the unjust honour Bentivoglio has done him at the expense of Phalaris. This carrying of the attack against the very citadel of Bentley's scholarship, though it might win him increased applause from those who sought primarily for entertainment from the quarrel, was in all else a quixotic effort. King was not unlearned himself, and so he does a disservice to his own pursuits when he attempts to deride Bentley's attention to the minutiae of learning, his discoveries about the quantities of the anapæst, and his chronological method of determining the period of a work, in all of which King considers Bentley to be as despicable as the quack astrologer, Lilly.

He was on surer ground in his general complaint against the unequal expenditure of learning upon trifles that are unworthy of it. When he says of Bentley 'that he argues upon Trifles, with too great Gravity, and manages serious Things with as much Lightness', he is stating a principle of decorum, the abuse of which is a constant theme of his writings. He had already made the same charge against Lister, and it was to be his constant cry against the Fellows of the Royal Society and their investigations, against which he was already meditating an attack. In their concern with apparent trifles, as in their frequent inelegance of style, Bentley and the Royal Society appeared to King, and to many others with him, as gross

offenders against classical good taste and common sense. By attaching his *Dissertation* to Wotton's *Reflections* Bentley had, in King's eyes, virtually become an ally of the Royal Society and to that extent at least a supporter of the new science.¹ Scholars of an older tradition were uneasily aware that there was something more behind this, that Bentley's methods in classical scholarship were not dissimilar to those pursued by the Royal Society in its investigations of the physical world, and they distrusted them all.

There is still clearer justification for the other precepts, of a more personal import, that King urges against Bentley in the *Dialogues*: that learning is but an ungracious virtue when it neglects common civility, and that a man who is too tender of his own dignity will only appear absurd in the eyes of other men. Bentley most certainly had facility in self-praise. It requires little elaboration by King to bring out the pomposity of a man who so frequently dwells on the praise that the world of learning has bestowed upon him and chides his opponents for daring to raise their protests against a 'Man in Holy Orders, a Doctor of Divinity, a Domestic Servant to one of the Greatest Kings'.²

King had now become generally recognized as one of the most effective of Bentley's critics; to such an extent, indeed, that when the *Battle of the Books* and the *Tale of a Tub* appeared in print in 1704 there were many readers who considered that only he could have written them. Such a considerable compliment to King's own exuberant wit and novel methods of assailing Bentley was not entirely undeserved. To King, nevertheless, the honour seemed a dubious one. Though no one was more capable of appreciating this new and anonymous author's original and lively contribution to a cause that King had made so eagerly his own, and though he must have been aware of the superiority of the *Battle of the Books* over his own, not dissimilar, skits on Bentley, he was none the less genuinely shocked by the coarseness and profanity of the *Tale*. For this reason he sought at once to clear himself of all scandalous imputation by publishing his scathing *Remarks on the Tale of a Tub* (1704), against his better judgement denying the book all claim to wit or learning, though obviously taking care to exempt from his strictures the *Battle of the Books* and those

¹ Bentley had, of course, become a Fellow of the Royal Society as early as 1694, about the very time that his quarrel with the Christ Church men began. As the first Boyle Lecturer in 1692, he had before this drawn on Newton's *Principia* for the support of Christian doctrine, in the process making Newton's work more widely known and appreciated. The Lectures obtained him a correspondence with Newton and the admiration of Evelyn. Soon he was able to count among his closest friends the most eminent of the 'Moderns', not only Newton and Evelyn, but Wren, Locke and Wotton as well.

² Bentley's *Dissertation*, 1699, Preface, pp. lxxx, lxxxiv.

parts of the *Tale* in which Swift had turned on Bentley and the modern critics.

Despite the reputation he had gained in this affair, King wrote nothing directly against Bentley between 1699 and 1712. By 1700, in fact, the full blaze of the controversy had left only the angry glow of its embers, which even the belated appearance of Swift's contribution did little to revive. King's concern was now increasingly with the pedantry and trifling of the scientists, and even that was interrupted by his residence and official duties in Ireland between 1701 and 1707. That he still bore Bentley a more than personal grudge is evident from the nature of his occasional remarks about him in his casual *Adversaria* and published writings. Yet the third edition of Wotton's *Reflections* in 1705 provoked him to nothing more than a couple of jeering remarks, in his *Letters to Dr. Lister*,¹ upon the champion of the Moderns and 'his dear Friend Dr. Bentley'. In these *Letters* his endeavour is rather to emphasize, by mingling his parody of both, that the inductive methods of Bentley and the virtuosi are fundamentally the same and, to him, entirely absurd. His contempt of them culminated in the sprightly and versatile mockery of the scientists and antiquaries in his *Useful Transactions* of 1709, where, though often touching Bentley closely, he does not mention him by name or single him out for any worse treatment than the others. So far Bentley had no reason to retract what he had exultantly written of his opponents in 1706: 'They have had enough of me and hereafter will let me alone'. Atterbury, indeed, had become positively friendly towards him. But King had not quite done with him yet and was only biding his time till Bentley should lay himself open again, as such an impetuous and domineering man was bound to do before long.

Bentley's notorious quarrel with the Fellows of Trinity, of which college he had been appointed Master at the end of 1699, provided just the opportunity King had been expecting. It was an occasion on which he hoped, by interposing in a small way with his pamphlet, *Some Account of Horace his Behaviour during his Stay at Trinity-College, in Cambridge* (1712), to prejudice the Master's cause in the college dispute and at the same time do some injury to his newly-published edition of Horace. Bentley's insolent manner and high-handed methods of governing Trinity College had abundantly justified King's earlier censures upon his character. Certainly his reforms were for the ultimate benefit of the college, which was invigorated and distinguished by his Mastership, but his suspicious and intolerant nature made it impossible for him to effect any great good

¹ Printed with the *Art of Cookery*, 1708 though probably written, in part at least, soon after the appearance of Lister's edition of Apicius Coelius, *De Opsoniis et Condimentis, sive Arte Coquinaria*, in 1705.

without using methods that aroused intense personal hostility to himself. As in the Phalaris controversy, he was always too ready to regard any opposition to his schemes as a personal slight calling for insolent personal retaliation. So it was that his schemes for financial reform in the college provoked a retaliatory complaint from the Fellows of excessive expenditure of college money upon supplies and renovations to the Master's Lodge. In the civil strife that followed the Master's declaration of war on his own college, a deadlock was reached by 1710, when each faction decided to seek public support for its cause; the trouble at Trinity soon became a rival to the trial of Sacheverell as a subject for excited gossip among the wits of London.

King had understandable sympathy for the Fellows as the objects of Bentley's contumely and the victims of his arbitrary ways, but he did not immediately join in this second pamphlet warfare against Bentley that broke out in 1710. He was at that time too pre-occupied, like Atterbury and others of Bentley's earlier opponents, writing in defence of Sacheverell and the Tory cause. Soon tiring of the racket of political journalism, and perhaps disillusioned by the inadequacy of official rewards, he was free to engage Bentley again by the time that the Master's long-delayed edition of Horace appeared at the end of 1711. Once again Bentley's own work, less flawless this time than when he wrote on Phalaris, furnished King with the means of ridiculing him. In dedicating the edition to Harley, Bentley playfully referred to Horace as a noble guest who had been staying with him while he was preparing this edition, 'cum jam du apud me non illiberali hospitio acceptus esset'; he now sends him on, so he not ungracefully pretends, with a recommendation to Harley, the Maecenas of the age. King was quick to see how he could enlarge this jest and turn it into an indictment of Bentley by attributing the inordinate expenditure in Trinity Lodge to the Master's 'non illiberale hospitium' to Horace, with the innuendo, quite contrary to the facts, that Bentley had bestowed on his edition of Horace the time and care that should have been devoted to the welfare of his college. In this spirit King wrote his burlesque account of Horace's behaviour at Trinity, offering it as a mock-defence of Bentley against the charge of rapacity in his dealings with the Fellows of that college.¹

¹ *Some Account of Horace, etc.* was apparently first printed in Part I of *Useful Miscellanies*, a collection of burlesques and parodies by King that appeared in July 1712, the last year of his life. Monk assigns it (*op. cit.*, p. 207) to 1710, the year in which public interest in the dispute was greatest and Miller published his *Remarks on Dr. Bentley's Letter*, on which King freely draws for the details of Bentley's expenditure. But King could not have written his skit until after the appearance of the dedication to Bentley's Horace, dated 7 December, 1711, which, as I have indicated above, must have suggested the plan of his burlesque. More than that, it was Bentley's incorporation of phrases from Horace in this dedication that gave King the clue for his choice of extracts from the poem to bear out his burlesque character of their author.

Time may have softened King's personal rancour but it had in no wise impaired his wit and ingenuity, and it is in the ingenuity of the scheme that the effectiveness of this piece mainly lies. Having already closely imitated Horace in his *Art of Cookery*, King was now carrying to a literary extreme the advice of Oldham on imitation, 'putting *Horace* into a more modern dress than hitherto he has appear'd in, that is, by making him speak, as if he were living and writing now';¹ and transporting him from Rome, even to Cambridge. The execution of his banter was a matter of beginning with Horace's own pretence that he might follow Cæsar and visit the 'Britannos hospitibus feros', and then, by adducing the many passages from the Odes and Epodes which readily gave colour to this burlesque character of Horace as a stout, care-free, self-indulgent Epicurean, convict him of being a heavy charge on his host and the college where he sojourned so long. A Horace always well-fed, 'Me pinguem et nitidum bene curata cute vises', has become during his stay at Trinity quite literally 'totus teres atque rotundus'. Thus Horace is maligned for the castigation of Bentley, both of whom appear as debauchees responsible for the exorbitant consumption of beer and victuals in the Master's Lodge, as was evidenced in the college accounts which Edmund Miller, one of the Fellows, had revealed to the public in an open letter to Bentley. The latter's rugged English style and obsolete expressions, which King had formerly made the subject of his ridicule, were dealt with by others on this occasion; nor does King here make more than one slight comment on the trivialities and presumption of Bentley's editing, though in these respects the edition of Horace was more vulnerable than the earlier works against which King had directed his censures.

King, of course, was well aware of this, and his attack on the editorial manner and methods, to be carried much further by the Scriblerus group, and ultimately in the *Dunciad*, had already been renewed. Thus, in the same *Useful Miscellanies* he introduced his brief farce, *The Tragi-Comedy of Joan of Hedington*, with a not very amusing travesty of a learned preface.² It is obvious that some of Bentley's methods are glanced at in this, notably in the somewhat ponderous parody of his methods of establishing the date of a Greek or Latin composition. There had already appeared in this same year the first parts of a more elaborately conceived attempt to discredit Bentley's Horace. This was *The Odes of Horace in Latin and English; With a Translation of Dr. Bentley's Notes. To which are added, Notes upon Notes; Done in the Bentleian Stile and Manner*. It continued to appear, probably fortnightly, in parts, which later included the Epodes

¹ Quoted by J. Butt in his edition of Pope's *Imitations of Horace*, London, 1939, pp. xxvi-xxvii.

² Cf. J. R. Sutherland's Introduction to his edition of *The Dunciad*, London, 1943, p. xi.

and the 'Carmen Seculare' as well.¹ The title page of the collected volume attributes the contents to 'several Hands', and it is almost certain that the lively and not wholly inadequate verse translations of Horace were done by William Oldisworth. This booksellers' hack was a younger associate of King, and it is more than likely that it was King who engaged him to provide these translations for a design which was once again the product of King's inventive mind, and for which, all the evidence suggests, King himself supplied at least the vulgarising translation of Bentley's notes and the original half-mocking, half-serious, notes upon the notes.²

It is in these 'Notes upon Notes' that the real sting is to be found. In a manner closely reminiscent of his *Useful Transactions* against the scientists and antiquaries, and often in the same words, he banters Bentley as caustically as ever, logically and derisively reducing his arguments to absurdity and once more indicting him with his own words on all those counts that had now so often been levelled against him. That King did not himself lack editorial acumen and critical good sense the following typical quotation from his notes will show:

Nothing is more common among Criticks, than to hear them comparing great Authors with one another; and if they can but find two or three Words in one, which upon the same or the like Occasion they find in another (a thing easy to be accounted for) presently they cry out, This is *stollen*, this is *borrowed*, this is *imitated*, or the like, and then they run on with a Collection of Scraps and Fragments of Prose and Poetry, with a long Catalogue of bright Names, on purpose to convince the Reader, that they have perused those Classics, at least their *Indexes*; by which Stratagem it often comes to pass, that they make one Author filch from another, who was not born till perhaps a Century after.³

¹ The first part of this work had appeared about the end of June and a short time before the *Useful Miscellanies*, which were advertised in the second part of the *Odes of Horace* as being published that same day, 15 July, 1712. Seventeen parts were published in 1712 and the remaining seven the following year, when all of them were bound together as a set, usually in two volumes, and later reprinted. Two other pamphlets that had been published in 1712 are sometimes included in these bound sets: a translation of Bentley's dedication to his Horace (to which is added a reprint of his earlier Latin poem to Halifax, with a translation, to emphasize his change of political front from Whig to Tory at a time most convenient for his own affairs); and, second, *The Life of Horace, with Dr. Bentley's Preface, Latin and English*.

² Monk, *op. cit.*, p. 250, records that it was once the general notion that King was the author of the whole thing, translations and all, and he had himself seen a copy of the book in an old binding, lettered *King's Horace*. His objection that King was dead (25 December, 1712) before publication was complete, need not deter us from assigning at least the 'Notes upon Notes' to him, for it is more likely to suppose that he would have prepared them all at one time, while working critically through Bentley's edition, than that he should have provided them piecemeal as publication required. They would thus be available for printing in the 1713 parts despite King's death in the meantime. The many resemblances to his *Useful Transactions* and to *Some Account of Horace*, and the whole evidence of method and style, convince me that the translation of Bentley's notes, probably, and the 'Notes upon Notes', certainly, were the work of King.

See also R. F. Jones, *Lewis Theobald*, New York, 1919, Appendix B, pp. 256-7.

³ Part III, p. 22.

There was a good deal of shrewd business sense as well behind this publication. By providing the Latin text of Horace in addition to the English translation, adding a selection of Bentley's notes in translation, and garnishing it all with the commentary gibes at the now no less notorious than eminent editor, King and Bernard Lintot, the publisher, were appealing to a circle of readers far more varied and extensive than that which Bentley's learned edition reached. They were profiting, both from the widely dispersed interest in Horace at that time (parts of this popular edition were advertised for the use of schools), and, less legitimately, from the clamour that had been raised over Bentley's edition, which in a way they were vulgarly looting. Further editions in 1713, 1714, 1719 (the translations separately), 1720 and 1725 leave no doubt about the popularity of this novel and very mixed edition of Horace, and suggest that, commercially at least, it was for a long time more successful than its learned counterpart.

King was dead before this serial publication had been completed; he died, it may be said, still railing at Bentley. He had come early into the dispute against Bentley in support of his college, but it was not only this sense of institutional loyalty, nor even his private liking for the fun of the thing, that induced him for the rest of his life to keep up an intermittent sniping against the 'awful Aristarch'. Bentley indeed provoked King by singling him out for some of his most scornful retorts, so that even more than Pope at a later date, King had cause to detest the harsh and overbearing character of his opponent. But he was also actuated, no less than Swift and Pope and their companions of the Scriblerus Club after him, by a genuine contempt for the growing pedantry of the age. Such objections were of course misguided when directed against the great achievements of Bentley's scholarship, but they were kept up, because King and his friends became increasingly aware that the studies of Bentley, as also the investigations being carried out by the virtuosi of the Royal Society, were evolving a new learning by new means, in opposition to those older and still largely Aristotelian methods by which they had been educated at Oxford. As late as 1703, we must remember, the Heads of Houses at Oxford had censured Locke's *Essay concerning Human Understanding* and had even tried by the exercise of their authority to prevent its being read in the University.

The dispute about Phalaris was only an offshoot of the contention about the comparative merits of Ancients and Moderns, and it was partly the irony of circumstance that had placed Bentley in alliance with the Modern side. The great classical scholar had no intention of fighting a battle against the ancient books or of lowering their literary eminence, but because his *Dissertation upon Phalaris* was published in association with

Wotton's rejoinder to Temple, the scholars of Christ Church had a common cause with the supporters of Temple in regarding Wotton and Bentley as enemy allies and fearing Bentley as a chief of the Modern host. Bentley himself quite clearly saw that the larger dispute extended to matters outside his province, and with these he had no wish to be involved, for he had a use for both ancient and modern learning without indulgence in unprofitable comparisons. So he publicly dissociated himself from any partisan view; but his disclaimers seem not to have been regarded.¹ And indeed it was not without good reason that King and his associates persisted in regarding Bentley as a bird of the same feather as the savants of the Royal Society. They perceived the scientific basis of the method he promoted in classical studies, and for that very reason they were prejudiced against it. The careful examination of detail in Bentley's textual criticism and the utilization of antiquities, philology, chronology and history for the assistance of literary criticism sprang from the same inquiring and co-ordinating temper of mind that was advancing the scientific studies of the day.

Pope realized this when, writing of Bentley, he significantly chose the microscope as an image to describe the function of the new literary criticism:

The critic Eye, that microscope of Wit,
Sees hairs and pores, examines bit by bit.²

This keen new instrument of scientific investigation was not for him a window opening on new worlds; it was rather a distorting glass for the old. And so were the studies of Bentley. To the Christ Church men similarly Bentley's methods were ridiculous trifling, an absurd distortion of values; but they were also a challenge to established authority in literary studies, and by the light of such authority they had been trained. Behind all their smaller and personal objections to Bentley was the resentment of conservative taste at the successful restatements of inductive scholarship. To this extent the men of letters like King and Pope, and a large section of the University men, were defending themselves against a new scholarship that owed something of its inspiration to science. Taking up the challenge, King had sought vainly to stem the advance by the light sallies of his wit and ridicule, sometimes directed against Bentley, at other times against the Royal Society.

¹ *Dissertation*, 1697, p. 6.

² *The Dunciad* (1743), IV, 233-4.

SIR WILLIAM JONES'S CHINESE STUDIES¹

By T. C. FAN

English interest in China can be traced back to the seventeenth century, or even earlier, when people began to realize that beyond the eastern horizon there existed an unknown land with an old civilization. In the next century the remote land was brought nearer by traders and missionaries; and the *chinoiseries*, ingenious travesties in the main of things Chinese, gathered force and by the mid-century came to compete with the Gothic and the Classic as fashions of the age. But intellectual and artistic contact between the two countries remained indirect, and the English were often bewildered by the conflicting accounts of China by French writers. It was not until the late eighteenth century, when Sir William Jones taught himself to decipher Chinese characters, that there were signs of direct cultural contact. Gradually frivolous attempts at matters of curiosity came to be replaced by more serious efforts to study China at first hand. With the endeavours of Sir William Jones as an orientalist, haphazard and unsuccessful as they were, sinology as such in English may be said to have begun.

Before he became a Scholar of University College, Oxford, Jones had begun his study of oriental languages. He proceeded, roughly, in this order: Hebrew, Arabic, Persian, Turkish, Sanskrit. At Oxford, according to Sir Robert Chambers, he used to keep 'a folio volume filled with extracts from Asiatick manuscripts', and had 'filled (in all) four such volumes with similar extracts, made in his own hand in the Bodleian Library'.² It may be assumed that he was then chiefly concerned with Arabic and Persian, and had not yet taken up Chinese. The first reference to his study of Chinese in Lord Teignmouth's *Memoirs* occurs in the winter of 1767, when he 'copied the keys of the Chinese language, which he wished to learn'.³ By the 'keys' Teignmouth probably means the tables of the radicals and derivatives of the Chinese language, of which a number had appeared in works on China since the seventeenth century. By 1770 he must have read *Confucius Sinarum Philosophus* (1687)—'les ouvrages moraux de Confucius traduits par le Père Couplet'. His letter to Charles Reviczki, dated 4 February 1770 from Nice—he was then travelling on the Continent with the Spencer family—contains a significant reference to a Confucian classic. He had written a 'Tract on Education' 'in the manner of Aristotle, that is, the

¹ I am indebted to Dr. L. F. Powell for encouragement and criticism.

² *Asiatick Researches*, vi (1799), 2-3.

³ *Memoirs of the Life, Writings, and Correspondence of Sir William Jones* (1804), p. 38. This edition is hereafter referred to as *Memoirs*.

analytick manner'.¹ Nothing remains of the Tract except its Plan.² Jones had read *Ta Hsüeh*, or *Great Learning*, the first of *The Four Books* in the Confucian collection; and it was the opening passage of that classic that had started him thinking on education. The Plan of the 'Tract' begins with this paragraph:

A celebrated Eastern philosopher begins his first dissertation with the following period. The perfect education of a great man, consists in three points: in cultivating and improving his understanding; in assisting and reforming his countrymen; and in procuring to himself the chief good, or a fixed and unalterable habit of virtue.

This is derived from Couplet's Latin translation of the classic. Of the three 'points', the first is a mistranslation, for in the original it means, not 'improving his understanding' as Jones takes it, but 'cultivating cardinal virtues', or, in James Legge's literal version, 'illustrating illustrious virtues'. But Jones does recognize that the primary aim of liberal education is virtue—'the good of ourselves and our fellow-creatures';³ and this is to be attained through the acquisition of knowledge and the cultivation of understanding or, according to Confucius, 'natural reason'. Platitudinous as it may seem, the Plan is characterized by an unusual breadth of view. We are told not to confine ourselves to Græco-Roman classics, but to make use of the 'accumulated experience and wisdom of all ages and all nations'. Jones puts emphasis on the study of languages as keys to such treasures—'languages of those people who have been, in any period of the world, distinguished for their superior knowledge'. Presumably, Chinese has a place in his curriculum of liberal education.

Such was the result of Jones's first acquaintance with Chinese classics: some Confucian ideas, imperfectly interpreted as they were in translation, had entered his mind. But his interest was not confined to matters of education. The Confucian book, from which he had quoted, contains some fragments of ancient poetry, and these had fascinated him. One of them he translated into Latin. In a letter to Reviczki from Spa in July 1770 he tells us how he translated the fragment and what he thought of it:

When I read the works of Confucius, translated by Couplet and others, I was struck with admiration at the venerable dignity of the sentiments, as well as at the poetical fragments, which adorn the discourses of that philosopher. They are selected from the most ancient records of Chinese poetry, and particularly from a work, entitled *Shi-king*, of which there is a fine copy in the

¹ *Memoirs*, p. 72.

² *Ibid.*, pp. 87-9.

³ Jones discussed his ideas of education with Richard Shepherd, later Archdeacon of Bedford, author of *An Essay on Education*, in a letter to William Jones, Esq.; see Shepherd, *Miscellanies* (1775), I, 287-305. Shepherd agrees with Jones that 'virtue is the great object of education'.

royal library at Paris. I immediately determined to examine the original, and referring to the volume, after a long study, I succeeded in comparing one of the odes with the version of Couplet, and analysed every word, or, more properly, every figure in it. Of this ode, I now send you a literal translation: it is a composition of a wonderful dignity and brevity; each verse contains four words only, hence the ellipsis is frequent in it, and the obscurity of the style adds to its sublimity. I have annexed a poetical version, making every verse correspond with the sense of Confucius; you will judge whether I have succeeded or not, it will be sufficient for me if it please you. You know that this philosopher, whom I may venture to call the Plato of China, lived about six hundred years before the Christian æra, and he quotes this ode, as very ancient in his time. It may therefore be considered as a most precious gem of antiquity, which proves, that poetry has been the admiration of all people in all ages, and that it every-where adopts the same images.¹

This letter reveals the writer's ardour and the industry with which he pursued oriental studies. Jones was not a mere philologist: philology was not the end of his studies, but the medium through which he could extract the poetry, whether it be *Hafiz*, or *Moallakat*, or *Sakuntala*, or Chinese odes.² One can realize his excitement and delight in deciphering the Chinese ode in the Royal Library at Paris: the 'keys of the Chinese language' he had learned could now be put to proper use. Reviczki was surprised at the accomplishment: he had never suspected that Chinese was one of Jones's acquisitions as a linguist. He was delighted with Jones's 'extraordinary composition', the 'Ode Sinica Antiquissima', which he pronounced as 'elegant'.³ Of the two versions, only the second—the poetical version—is preserved: it was first published in *Poeseos Asiaticæ Commentariorum libri sex* (1774), and has been included in his *Works* and in Chalmers's *English Poets*.⁴ It is frankly a paraphrase, not a 'regular' translation. What Jones did in Latin for the Chinese ode is precisely the same as what he had done in English for an Arabian eclogue, an Indian tale, a Persian song, and a Turkish ode in his early *Poems, consisting chiefly of Translations from the Asiatick Languages* (1772).

We know very little how Jones learned his Chinese, or whether he had any assistance from those who knew the language. But a passage in his letter to John Wilmot throws some light upon the subject. In 1771, when Jones had published his French translation of the *Life of Nadir Shah*, Wilmot, 'a young but learned theologian' studying Arabic and Persian literature, sent him a list of words which were supposed to be Persian.

¹ *Memoirs*, pp. 80-1. Jones's original Latin letter is printed *et.*, 435.

² Cf. R. M. Hewitt, 'Harmonious Jones', *Essays and Studies by Members of the English Association*, XXVIII (1942), 42-59.

³ *Memoirs*, pp. 83, 437.

⁴ *Works of Sir William Jones* (ed. Lady Jones, 1799), II, 351; IV, 513. This edition is hereafter referred to as *Works*. See Chalmers, *English Poets*, XVIII, 470.

They were *not* Persian, but Chinese. To this inquiry Jones replied on 3 June 1771 as follows:

I am sorry the characters you sent me are not Persian but Chinese, which I cannot decypher without a book, which I have not at present, but tous chinois qu'ils sont, I shall be able to make them out, when the weather will permit me to sit in the Bodleian. In the mean time, I would advise you to enquire after a native of China, who is now in London; I cannot recollect where he lodges, but shall know when I come to town, which will be to-morrow or Saturday.¹

This is interesting: it gives us an idea of his knowledge of Chinese and a clue as to the assistance he may have received in his Chinese studies. So far as I can ascertain, there were at least two natives of China in London in the 'seventies, and it is almost certain that Jones knew both. One of them, by the name of Tan chetqua, better known as Chitqua, a modeller from Canton, had come to England in 1769; and by 1770, and for the next year or two, he was the fashion in London.² His lodging at Mr. Marr's in the Strand was much frequented by savants, connoisseurs and artists. The Royal Family had been pleased to receive him and had given him several commissions for small modelled portraits, in which he excelled. In the exhibition of the Royal Academy in 1770 he was represented by a bust, and his swarthy figure may be found in Zoffany's great picture, *The Life School in the Royal Academy* (now in the Royal Collection at Buckingham Palace), in which he is seen in the background, peeping over the shoulders of Benjamin West and Jeremiah Meyer. An artist after a fashion and a sensible man, he was a popular 'silent traveller' in the eighteenth century. He knew a little English, and, judging from the quaint letter he wrote to three Oxford ladies,³ he was not an illiterate. Jones must have met him and may have consulted him about some difficult characters.

The other 'native of China' with whom Jones came into contact either by 1770 or later was named Whang Atong, a younger man, also from Canton. It was said that before he became a trader he had passed with credit the civil examinations of the bachelor's degree.⁴ In his letter to Jones, dated 10 December 1784 from Canton, Whang writes: 'I remember the pleasure of dining with you in company with Capt. Blake and Sir Joshua Reynolds; and I shall always remember the kindness of my friends in

¹ *Memoirs*, p. 98.

² A detailed account of Chitqua may be found in the *Gentleman's Magazine* for 1771 (xli, 237-8) and J. Nichols, *Literary Illustrations*, v, 318. William T. Whitney has published additional data, including an amusing letter Chitqua wrote to three Oxford ladies, in his *Artists and their Friends, 1700-1800*, I, 269-70. Chitqua seems to have been on familiar terms with Sir William Chambers. To the second edition of his *Dissertation on Oriental Gardening* (1774) is annexed an explanatory discourse which Chambers wrote in the name of Chitqua.

³ See the previous note.

⁴ *Works*, I, 372.

England.' ¹ As we shall see later, Jones seems to have learned more from Whang the scholar-trader than from Chitqua the modeller. But no date can be ascertained for Whang's sojourn in London, and no record has yet been found of his activities in England except the letter which he wrote to Jones from Canton.

Linguistic prodigy as he was, Jones never got very far in his study of the Chinese language. He never had tutors for Chinese as Mirza the Syrian for Arabic and Persian. In a paper which Teignmouth prints in his *Memoirs*, he classifies the languages he knew into three groups.² In the first group there are eight languages 'studied critically'; in the second there are also eight, 'studied less perfectly, but all intelligible with a dictionary'; in the third there are twelve, 'studied least perfectly, but all attainable'. The last group—one may note with interest that Welsh, the tongue of his native land, belongs to this group—begins with Tibetan and ends with Chinese. Before he went to India he was already able to decipher Chinese characters, or 'figures' as he called them; and in India he may have made some attempts at further improvement. But his knowledge of Chinese seems never to have got much beyond the stage of deciphering characters. Chinese has always been considered difficult; its form, so different from European languages, is simply forbidding. Having mastered several difficult languages, Jones thought that the difficulty of Chinese had been magnified beyond the truth. Étienne Fourmont had published his perspicuous *Grammatica Sinica* (1742) and copious dictionaries in Chinese and Latin were already available. With such a grammar and one of these lexicons one could, says Jones, read the original works of Confucius with the Latin translations by Couplet; and having made the first step with attention, one would have traversed 'at least half of his career'.³ Jones never doubted that Chinese, in spite of the vast labyrinths of characters, was attainable, though he never attained mastery of it. He seems to have tried his hand at calligraphy. In his *Works* are preserved two transcripts of the Chinese ode he had translated: the second is a better copy, but the earlier one, which he published in his Latin commentary on Asiatic poetry, seems to have come from his hand.⁴ Of the thirty-six sprawling characters, distorted in form, some have too few strokes, others too many; but they are not beyond recognition.

In 1783 Jones went to India, as Judge of the Supreme Court of Judicature at Fort William. In the next year he founded the Bengal Asiatic Society 'for inquiring into the history, civil and natural, the antiquities, arts, sciences, and literature of Asia'. In his first annual discourse to the

¹ *Asiatick Researches* (1790), II, 204.

² *Memoirs*, p. 376.

³ *Works*, I, 158.

⁴ *Ibid.*, I, 369; II, 351.

Society (1784) he describes his mind as having been 'accustomed to contemplate with delight the eventful histories and agreeable fictions of this eastern world'. His main interests in the field of Chinese studies were: a complete translation of *Shi King*, i.e. *The Classic of Poetry*; a verbal translation of *Lun Yü*, i.e. *The Analects*; and an authentic abridgement of Chinese laws, civil and criminal.¹ Of the three items he was particularly interested in *Shi King*, 'a most valuable and excellent work'; it is on the list of 'Objects of Enquiry' which he drew up during his voyage to India.² In India he kept up his correspondence with Whang Atong of Canton, of whose knowledge and ingenuity he had a high opinion. He had tried to induce Whang to translate *Shi King*, but without success. Whang's letter to Jones, part of which I have quoted, contains the following passage:

The Chinese book, *Shi King*, that contains three hundred Poems, with remarks thereon, and the work of *Con-fu-tsu*, and his grandson, the *Tai Ho* [*Ta Hsüeh*], I beg you will accept; but to translate the work into English will require a great deal of time; perhaps three or four years; and I am so much engaged in business, that I hope you will excuse my not undertaking it.³

Such being the case, John Henry Cox, who had gone to Canton in 1781 'for the benefit of his health' and later became a partner of Messrs. Cox & Beale,⁴ ventured to undertake the translation with the assistance of Whang. It does not seem that Cox was qualified for the task, but he promised to send to Jones some fruits of the collaboration. For a time Jones thought that a little encouragement would induce Whang to visit India together with some of his compatriots. 'Considerable advantage to the publick, as well as to letters', he said, 'might be reaped from the knowledge and ingenuity of such emigrants.'⁵

As President of the Asiatic Society, Jones delivered a number of discourses, for the Society was 'a puny, rickety child and must be fed with pap'. Sometime between 1785 and 1788 he lectured 'On the Second Classical Book of the Chinese', which gives a succinct account of *Shi King* with remarks of Confucius on its significance.⁶ The interest of the discourse lies mainly in the translations of three fragments of ancient Chinese poetry. Of each fragment he gives a double version, one verbal and the other metrical—the only method of doing justice to the poetical compositions of the *Asiaticks*'. The poem which he had translated into Latin—

¹ *Works*, I, ix; 372.

² *Memoirs*, p. 228.

³ *Asiatick Researches*, II, 204. Whang's gifts to Jones—*Shi King* and *Ta Hsüeh*—were among the books and manuscripts which Jones presented to the Royal Society in 1792. The collection also contains *The Analects*, *The Book of Mencius*, and a Chinese-Latin dictionary. See *Works*, VI, 452-53.

⁴ H. B. Morse, *The Chronicle of the East India Company trading to China, 1635-1834*, II, 85, 142, 187.

⁵ *Works*, I, 272-73.

⁶ *Works*, I, 365-73.

'a most precious gem of antiquity'—he now rendered into English. Here is the verbal translation :

Behold yon reach of *the river* Ki;
 Its green reeds how luxuriant! how luxuriant!
 Thus is our Prince adorned with virtues;
 As a carver, as a filer, of ivory,
 As a cutter, as a polisher, of gems.
 O how elate and sagacious! O how dauntless and composed!
 How worthy of fame! How worthy of reverence!
 We have a Prince adorned with virtues,
 Whom to the end of *time* we can not forget.

This version he printed with small figures over the words, referring to the original of which he gives a transcript. It is fairly accurate: though unpoetical, it gives us the *idea* of the poem. One can appreciate its merits by comparing it with the version of Thomas Percy. Percy had translated, or travestied, all the three fragments,¹ from the same source, viz. the Latin of Couplet. Percy knew no Chinese; yet having definite ideas of how poetry should be written and improved, he took the liberty to make omissions and additions. It is possible that Percy's Chinese tracts had aroused Jones's interest in a remote treasure; but what a difference a modicum of Chinese could make in translation! Jones is infinitely superior; he went beyond Couplet and was able to decipher the original, though perhaps not without the assistance of Latin translations. To the literal version quoted above is attached a metrical one, in six stanzas :

Behold, where yon blue riv'let glides
 Along the laughing dale;
 Light reeds bedeck its verdant sides,
 And frolick in the gale:
 So shines our Prince! In bright array
 The Virtues round him wait;
 And sweetly smil'd th' auspicious day,
 That rais'd Him o'er our State.
 As pliant hands in shapes refin'd
 Rich iv'ry carve and smoothe,
 His *Laws* thus mould each ductile mind,
 And every passion soothe.
 As gems are taught by patient art
 In sparkling ranks to beam,
 With *Manners* thus he forms the heart,
 And spreads a gen'ral gleam.
 What soft, yet awful, dignity!
 What meek, yet manly, grace!
 What sweetness dances in his eye,
 And blossoms in his face!

¹ *Hau Kiou Choaan*, IV, 233-7.

So shines our Prince! A sky-born crowd
 Of Virtues round him blaze:
 Ne'er shall Oblivion's murky cloud
 Obscure his deathless praise.¹

This is eighteenth-century verse, with nothing Chinese about it. The polished simplicity of the original is gone, and anyone who expects some local colour of the antique land will be thoroughly disappointed. Unlike the *Persian Song of Hafiz*, Jones's paraphrases from *Shi King* are singularly free from the 'romantic' glamour, *les appels de l'Orient*. And much of the finesse and an unobtrusive perfection of form are lost in a mass of conventional verbiage. A Chinese epithalamium, for instance, begins with a reference to the blazing flowers of the peach-tree; Jones converts it into an octosyllabic circumlocution: 'Gay child of Spring, the garden's queen.' There is no charm, not even the quaint atmospheric charm of Chinese verse, sometimes achieved in recent translations.

Of the many anniversary discourses Jones delivered to the Asiatic Society, the seventh (25 February 1790) is devoted to China. Jones took up an extremely difficult question: 'Whence came the singular people, who long had governed *China*, before they were conquered by the Tartars?' Many theories had been advanced, each having its supporters; but none was universally accepted. Ethnology and anthropology were still in their infancy. Were the Chinese an indigenous race, settled for ages, if not from eternity, in the land which they possessed? Or were they, according to missionaries, of the same stock as the Hebrews and Arabs? Or were they, as M. Pauw held dogmatically, the descendants of the Tartars? Or were they, as M. de Guignes had maintained with apparent ingenuity, Egyptian or Ethiopian *émigrés*? Jones had no sympathy with any of these theories. He was in favour of the Brahmin theory that the Chinese were originally the Hindus of the *Kshatriya* caste, who in consequence of the omission of sacred rites had in remote antiquity been forced to wander from India. His authority was a passage in the *Institutes of Manu* which he had undertaken to translate,² and he was misled by the pundits with whom he worked. In support of the theory which he had arrived at, 'as the result of long and anxious inquiries', he proposed to examine the Chinese language and letters, their religion and philosophy, their ancient monuments, their sciences and arts. And in making the comprehensive survey, he betrayed incidentally his meagre knowledge of China. In his lecture 'On the Second Classical Book of the Chinese', he had called China 'that most ancient and wonderful Empire', renowned for 'useful arts' and 'valuable productions.'³ In this discourse, in an attempt at drastic condensation,

¹ *Works*, I, 369-70; cf. Chalmers, *English Poets*, XVIII, 468.

² *Works*, I, 99; III, 389. Cf. G. Buhler, *The Law of Manu* (1886), pp. 412-3.

³ *Works*, I, 365.

he revealed an entirely different attitude. Here is what he said about the achievements of China :

Their spoken *language*, not having been preserved by the usual symbols of articulate sounds, must have been for many ages in a continual flux; their *letters*, if we may so call them, are merely the symbols of ideas; their popular *religion* was imported from India in an age comparatively modern; and their *philosophy* seems yet in so rude a state, as hardly to deserve the appellation; they have no *ancient monuments*, from which their origin can be traced even by plausible conjecture; their *sciences* are wholly exotick; and their *mechanical arts* have nothing in them characteristic of a particular family; nothing, which any set of men, in a country so highly favoured by nature, might not have discovered and improved. They have, indeed, both national musick and national poetry, and both of them beautifully pathetick; but of painting, sculpture, or architecture, as arts of imagination, they seem (like other *Asiaticks*) to have no idea.¹

Here we have a long series of astonishing statements, so flagrantly inadequate as to make refutation absolutely unnecessary.

But this does not prove his theory: he must produce evidence, and this he does by going through all the labyrinths of antiquity. He thinks that Fohi, the legendary emperor of China, was the same person as Budha (the genius of the planet Mercury) of the Indian *Puranas*. Myths and legends about the Deluge were pressed into service, and several passages in the discourse, though absurd, are extremely diverting. His identification of Fohi with Budha is no less humorous than the Jesuit's identification of Fohi with Noah—a theory satirized in *The Citizen of the World* (Letter No. 89). Oliver Goldsmith the journalist, who never had any pretence to scholarship, seems to be wiser than the oriental scholar! Equally flimsy as evidence are the parallels that Jones gives between Hindus and Chinese in ceremonies and popular superstitions. Both believed in the agency of genii or tutelary spirits, presiding over the stars and the clouds, over lakes and rivers, mountains, valleys, and woods, over the 'five elements', especially over fire, to which they offered sacrifices. Among other similarities are their fasts and festivals, particularly at the solstices and equinoxes; their cycle of sixty years; and their predilection for the mystic number *nine*. The conclusion is that Chinese and Hindus were originally one and the same race, only they have been separated from each other for four thousand years.²

The fact is that Jones knew more about Arabia, Persia, and India than the Extreme Orient. For his ethnological treatment of the Chinese people he had to rely on French controversial works by M. de Gentil, M. Bailly, and M. du Halde. The only works of China with which he could claim

¹ *Works*, 1, 101-2.

² *Works*, 1, 105-8.

some acquaintance were *Shi King* and *The Analects* of Confucius, of which he owned copies in the original, now to be found in the library of the Royal Society. He was therefore on safer ground when his discussion was confined to these books. In his *Works* one may find a number of citations from Confucian classics: they are not always accurate, and some are misleading; but Jones's familiarity with the texts is unquestionable. Here is an instance:

Of the religious opinions, entertained by Confucius and his followers, we may glean a general notion from the fragments of their works translated by Couplet: they professed a firm belief in the supreme God, and gave a demonstration of his being and his providence from the exquisite beauty and perfection of the celestial bodies, and the wonderful order of nature in the whole fabrick of the visible world. From this belief they deduced a system of Ethics, which the philosopher sums up in a few words at the close of the *Lün-yü*: 'He,' says Confucius, 'who shall be fully persuaded, that the Lord of Heaven governs the universe, who shall in all things chuse moderation, who shall perfectly know his own species, and so act among them, that his life and manners may conform to his knowledge of God and man, may be truly said to discharge all the duties of a sage, and to be far exalted above the common herd of the human race.'¹

The Confucian quotation is a paraphrase, or commentary, based upon the Latin text of Couplet. In another place Jones discussed the similarity between Christian doctrines and Confucian maxims. He was perfectly aware that in so doing he was exposing himself to the ridicule and abuse of the 'zealous men'; but he also knew that he was free from their 'uncandid asperity'.² Considering the spirit of the age, this must be regarded as unusually daring. For many years the orthodox and evangelical, who dismissed the non-Christian systems of religion and ethics as heathen *en masse*, could hardly tolerate a comparison between biblical lessons and Confucian wisdom. Even a century later James Legge, the eminent translator of Chinese Classics, never missed the opportunity of demonstrating the superiority of Christianity in his commentaries. Jones was regarded as 'the most enlighten'd of the sons of men': he was certainly more tolerant than most of his contemporaries. He never failed to speak of Confucius with respect: in his early writings Confucius was the Plato of China; in his later writings he was the Socrates of China—a more apt comparison—with Tseng Tsū as Xenophon and Mencius as Plato.³ What is significant about his casual remarks on Chinese philosophers lies not in what he said, but in the way he said it. A liberal, or rather comparative, point of view is discernible.

Jones was a man with 'plans', 'desiderata', and 'objects of inquiry', a

¹ *Works*, I, 106-7. Cf. *Confucius Sinarum Philosophus*, 157-58; *The Analects*, Bk. xx, Ch. 3.

² *Works*, I, 168.

³ *Memoirs*, pp. 81, 435; *Works*, I, 371.

number of which were never carried out. His life, one of unusual splendour, was much too short for him. Given a longer span and less administrative routine, he would have been able to explore the 'Poetry, Rhetoric, and Morality of Asia', or at least complete his projects of translation from Chinese classics. *Cherchez le savoir fut-il à la Chine*—this was the motto he adopted for his French dissertation on oriental literature (1771). A voyage to that country, by a circuitous route to England, was among the designs he did not live to execute.¹ But he remains a worthy precursor of Marshman, of the Morrisons and the Medhursts, and of other British sinologues of the nineteenth century.

¹ *Memoirs*, pp. 349, 352. On 20 February 1794 when he was giving a discourse on Asiatic science and philosophy at the Asiatic Society, he announced that he would lecture in the next annual meeting of the Society on the fine arts of Asia. Two months later he died. The auction *Catalogue of the Library of the late Sir William Jones* (1831) contains a manuscript of 38 Chinese drawings 'with Explanations in English, and Observations on Chinese Music'. This may have been some of the materials he had collected for the projected lecture.

NOTES AND OBSERVATIONS

TOURNEUR AND THE STARS

In *R.E.S.*, xvi (1940) Mr. Kenneth Cameron published an article on Tourneur's *Transformed Metamorphosis* in which he interprets that difficult poem in the light of the dedicatory sonnet as an exalted compliment to the old Knight, Sir Christopher Heydon, then living in retirement on his estates in Norfolk. Two things are known about Heydon. In the first place, he was a fervent Protestant, very active against the Catholic recusants in his county, and as such, according to Mr. Cameron's theory, he is represented in the poem by the Knight Mavortio, who slays the monster (Popery) that is destroying the island of Delta (England). (It will have been observed how well this alignment of Tourneur with extreme Protestantism harmonises with the suggestion made by Mr. Michael Higgins (*R.E.S.*, xix, 1943) that *The Atheist's Tragedy* shows the influence of Calvinistic thought.) Secondly, Heydon was deeply interested in judicial astrology on which he wrote two books, *A Defence of Judiciall Astrology* (1603) and *An Astrological Discourse* (1650). Neither was in print when the *Transformed Metamorphosis* appeared in 1600, but there is no difficulty in assuming that his patron's convictions were well-known to Tourneur and are reflected in his presentation of Mavortio as not only a warrior but a 'squire of the muses . . . who bent his mind to pure Uranian uses' (l. 485).¹ Urania is the only Muse particularized, and her name, together with the adjective and abstract noun derived from it, appears six times, with emphasis, in the part of the poem describing the apotheosis of Mavortio (ll. 460, 481, 482, 495, 561, 603) and once in the *Epilogue* (l. 5). Urania alone, we are told, when the Castalian spring is defiled in the evil metamorphosis of the world and the other Muses are 'infected with that pois'nous cup', maintains her place upon Parnassus; 'there bides she eu'ry storme'. Moreover, both at the beginning and the end of the poem the state of the world is linked with that of the heavens. The disorder in the skies prepares us for that on the earth. The stars have left their due places, and stable relations:

Subject vnto th'vnstedfast moones controle
Do stand the lights that should truth animate;
And by their shine her woe extenuate. (ll. 26-8.)

¹ The line references are taken from *The Works of Cyril Tourneur*, ed. Allardyce Nicoll (1930).

Below, we are shown 'Earth's stage compleate with tragick sceanes of wee'. In the last stanzas (the most enigmatic of this aggressively obscure poem) the expected process seems, by a tremendous hyperbole, to be reversed. Delta has been cleansed by Mavortio, and now light, pouring from the eyes of the Unicorn (James VI of Scotland?) purifies the world, including the Castalian fountain, penetrates the cloudy skies and restores harmony among the 'sacred lights' of Heaven. This is not orthodox astrology, but it was a language designed to appeal to the old astrologer, whose patronage Tourneur may have wished to direct towards his own purified Muse. It therefore becomes interesting to inquire what traces there are in Tourneur's other works of a special interest in astrology, extending beyond the conventional imagery which was at the command of any poet of that age.

The Revenger's Tragedy can be dismissed at once. There all is darkness and torch-light. The sinful souls contemplate their sin with satisfaction, but do not look up to the skies until, in the last scene of all, the blazing star, portending Heaven's vengeance, shows its 'ill-knotted' fire at Lussurioso's banquet. In the *Funerall Poem Vpon the Death of the Most Worthy and True Souldier; Sir Francis Vere, Knight* (1609) one astrological metaphor is carried out with the precision that Dr. Ellis-Fermor (*M.L.R.*, xxx) notes as characteristic of Tourneur. The example of Sir Francis Vere, says his panegyrist, raised the soldierly spirit of the men under his command to the highest pitch:

And in that moouing Orbe of active warre;
His high command was the transcendent starre,
Whose influence, for production of mens worthes,
Did gouerne at their militarie Birthes;
And made them fit for Armes.

It is, however, in *The Atheist's Tragedy* that the stars as the instruments of the divine purpose make a really notable appearance, for here the crowning blasphemies of D'Amville consist in his denial of their influence. The position of these passages in the play is all-important. Astrological references in themselves might prove no more than an imaginative response in Tourneur to what was common matter of belief in his time. But *The Atheist's Tragedy* is a serious play, dealing with the modes of thought that lead to damnation or salvation, and it cannot be without significance that D'Amville's scepticism of the divine government of the world takes this particular form at two important turning-points of the action, first, when he has accomplished the murder of his brother, and secondly, just before the strokes of God's vengeance begin to rain on him. It is admitted that blasphemy on the public stage had to be discreet. D'Amville could not be made to talk as Marlowe is said to have talked

among his friends. Even so, Tourneur had a choice. Elsewhere in the play his atheist denies the immortality of the soul, refers to Nature as the ultimate power, and levels man with the beasts. On these premises he erects his conclusion that

All the purposes of man
Aime but at one of these two ends; pleasure
Or profit.

This is strong enough, and more unmistakably atheistic at first sight than the denial of planetary influence; yet it is this denial that is reserved to mark the two crucial moments of the action.

D'Amville's murder of his brother comes early in the play. It is the only heinous crime that he is able to complete and enjoy the fruits of, since the others are frustrated. It is also the occasion on which he receives and belittles the first warning of Heaven's wrath. Like Shakespeare's Edmund, also a sceptic as to the influence of the stars, he simulates belief as part of his disguise. In the foggy darkness he has thrust his brother into a gravel-pit where his creature, Borachio, has brained him with a stone, and when the servants bring in the body he cries out, with impeccable orthodoxy, to the hidden stars:

You vize-royes to the King of nature!
Whose constellations gouverne mortall births;
Where is that fatall Planet rul'd at his
Natiuitie? That might ha' pleas'd to light
Him out, as well into th' world. (II, iv, 49-53.)

When he is left alone with Borachio he plumes himself on the skill with which he has engineered his plot and especially on his use of unconscious agents, the chaplain and the drunken servants. Borachio applauds him.

D'Am. Here was a murther brauely carryed, through
The eye of obseruation, unobserved.
Bor. And those that saw the passage of it, made
The Instruments yet knew not what they did.

On this sentence D'Amville raises a towering blasphemy, comparing himself, controlling his plot through unconscious instruments, to God, directing the affairs of the world through the unconscious planets. The words 'ascribe', 'call', and 'making' mark his scorn of the notion.

D'Am. That power of rule Philosophers ascribe
To him they call the supream of the Starres;
Making their influences governours
Of Sublunarie Creatures; when their selues
Are senseless of their operations. (II, iv. 157-161.)

On these words the black heavens thunder and lighten. Borachio starts in fear, but the atheist first explains thunder scientifically and then compares

the 'brave noyse' to a peal of ordnance, gracing a triumph. 'It speaks encouragement.'

The second passage occurs at the beginning of Act v. D'Amville, shaken by his experiences in the churchyard but resolute to continue his course, sits handling the gold that was the cause of his fratricide. With a stubborn arrogance he taunts the 'ignorant Astronomer' who seeks for men's fortunes among the planets. These gold pieces are the stars that make the fortunes of men, and on these the stars in heaven gaze with the devotion of subjects 'rais'd Into their loftie houses, when their Prince Rides vnderneath th' ambition of their loues'. In place of God, working through the stars, the supreme power in human life is the enlightened intellect of man, working through gold:

These are the Starres the Ministers of Fate;
And Man's high wisdom the superiour power,
To which their forces are subordinate. (v. i. 18-34.)

This second mockery of the assumptions of astrology is the signal for the suspended judgement of God to fall. The ghost of his brother threatens him; servants enter with the body of one son, and the other is drawn forth on a bed to die. In rage and despair the atheist rushes on his end.

The case for Tourneur's special interest in astrology stands on these two passages, but in the light of them the distribution of darkness and star-light through the play, which might otherwise have been regarded merely as 'atmosphere', gains significance. During the first three acts the stars, which are symbols and instruments of the divine government of the world, are hidden. The night of the murder is 'exceeding darke, not one poore sparke in the whole spacious skye'.¹ The ghost of Montferrers appears to his son on a 'foule stormy night'.² Over the churchyard, however, where the virtue of Charlemont and Castabella rings true under the test and D'Amville's murderous and incestuous intentions are foiled, the stars are shining. D'Amville seems to have relied on darkness to cover the second murder as well,³ but it fails him, and he himself notes the change in a magnificent passage which looks back to his amorous image at the close of the murder scene. Then black night had been the 'beauteous Mistresse of a murderer'; now the sky is a treacherous bawd:

And that Bawde,
The skie there; she could shut the windowes and
The dores of this great chamber of the world;
And draw the curtaines of the clouds betweene
Those lights and me about this bed of earth,
When that same Strumpet Murder & my selfe
Committed sin together. (iv, iii, 244-50.)

¹ II, iv, 14; II, iv, 44-9; and cf. II, ii, 60; II, iv, 150 and 203, and, in retrospect, IV, iii, 245-52.

² II, vi, 10.

³ IV, ii, 27.

He is not arguing now, but tormented by an incandescent imagination and a guilty conscience, so that in the 'faire white cloude', moving across the starlit sky, he sees momentarily 'the Ghoast of olde *Montferrers* in a long white sheete'. In the closet, where he handles his treasure, he is still aware of the stars shining outside. They are 'yond' lesser lights' in the speech already summarized, in which he seeks to humble them beneath his gold. We feel their presence. Their final appearance is at the end of the scene, where D'Amville, rebuked by the doctor, can no longer maintain his atheism and breaks down into frenzy. By the bodies of his dead sons, whom the doctor cannot revive even at the price of all his gold, the atheist admits the suspicion that there must be some power above Nature that controls her force. The doctor contributes the clinching argument, that Nature, who 'never did bring forth A man without a Man', could not have fashioned the first one, and D'Amville breaks out against the false goddess who has misled him:

Now to myself I am ridiculous.
 Nature thou art a Traytour to my soule.
 Thou hast abus'd my trust. I will complaine
 To a superiour Court, to right my wrong.
 I'll proue thee a forger of false assurances.
 In yond' Starre chamber thou shalt answere it. (V. i. 126-44.)

It is, as Dr. Ellis-Fermor says, a combination of pun and poetic metaphor. It also suggests, in the majesty and terror of the imagery, the reversal of feeling in D'Amville. The stars are no longer the 'light corrupted eyes' of a bawd,¹ nor poor subjects clambering up to look down upon the treasure of sovereign man; they are his judges and inquisitors, and to avoid their dreadful scrutiny he tries to thrust into their 'Superior Court' the fraudulent culprit, Nature. It is not a logical recantation. Atheism, the supreme folly, has sapped his reason, so that he has been blind to the elementary argument of the doctor, and what follows is distraction.

J. M. S. TOMPKINS.

WALTER SCOTT'S BARONETCY

The credit which George IV has often been given for honouring Walter Scott is really undeserved. The truth, as revealed in a letter now published for the first time from the manuscripts in the Public Record Office, is that the Prince Regent completely ignored the suggestion that Scott should be given a baronetcy, made in February 1818 by William Adam,

¹ IV., iii, 257.

the Lord Chief Commissioner of the Scottish Jury Court¹; and not until the matter was placed in the hands of the Government did it receive proper consideration. Lockhart, therefore, was quite wrong in saying, 'The Baronetcy was conferred . . . not in consequence of any ministerial suggestion, but by the King personally, and of his own unsolicited motion'.²

Nor does the Prime Minister himself emerge with much honour. It is not creditable to him that he should have hesitated to recommend for this honour the most distinguished novelist of the age, merely because, since 1812, he had agreed to an excessive number of such creations. On this occasion, in fact, Lord Liverpool exhibited his characteristic timidity.

It is perhaps rather surprising that William Adam addressed his letter to the Secretary of State for Home Affairs. One would have expected him to write either to the Prime Minister or to Charles Arbuthnot, the Parliamentary Secretary of the Treasury, who consulted with Lord Liverpool on all questions of such patronage as was in the gift of the Treasury.

William Adam to Viscount Sidmouth.

Blair Adam, April 7th, 1818.

(Most secret.)

My dear Lord,

I am going to take a great liberty with your Lordship, but the feeling which you have never failed to excite in my mind, by the kind and confidential treatment which I have always met with, in our intercourse, makes me quite secure that you will always impute my communications to a pure motive.

What I am about to mention, judging by your ardent and unsophisticated admiration of literary genius, will, I am sure, either be carried into effect with zeal, or this letter be thrown into the fire, and remain a secret between us.

It has long appeared to me that Walter Scott, whose genius you admire, and on whose character you set a just value, should receive some mark of distinction, designating the estimation in which he is held by the Prince Regent, and appearing to flow from the spontaneous suggestions of His Royal Highness's own mind, and manifesting his disposition to signalize a person who has combined the power of illustrating history and antiquity with the splendor of genius, and yet faithfully adhering to historic truth and antiquarian accuracy.

Your Lordship may, perhaps, know that I have already ventured, unknown to Mr. Scott (and what I write now is equally without his knowledge) to suggest something of this sort.

Perhaps from not well understanding my meaning, the matter has dropt into silence and oblivion.

My suggestion arose out of the opening the Repository of the Scotch

¹ He had been, successively, Solicitor-General and Attorney-General to the Prince of Wales, Keeper of the Great Seal for the Duchy of Cornwall, and, since 1816, Lord Chief Commissioner.

² Lockhart's *Life of Sir Walter Scott* (1898), p. 460.

Regalia. I thought he might be made a Knight Marshall for their chief custody, and as knighting is but a fleeting honour, that it should have been accompanied with the rank of baronet.

It was soon apparent that the custody of the Regalia would create discussion with many pretenders. I do not, therefore, mean to revive this part of my original suggestion; but I cannot help thinking that the Prince would have great gratification in distinguishing Scott's superior genius with the rank of baronet, to which as a gentleman he might be called with propriety, and which he could hand down to his children with ample means to sustain the honour.

I suggested my original plan to the Prince, and have since written to Lord Melville¹ about it. I leave it to your Lordship to revive the measure on the restricted plan, being confident that such a mark of distinction, bestowed on Walter Scott, would be applauded by an admiring nation.

(P.R.O., H.O. 102/29/60.)

Viscount Sidmouth to William Adam.

Clifford Street, April ye 12th, 1818. Confidential.

(Copy.)

My dear Lord,

I admire Walter Scott, not only for his genius and acquirements, but for his principles and character, and should rejoice to see a suitable mark of distinction conferr'd upon him by the Crown. Your suggestion was therefore presented to a prepared and willing mind. I will take an early opportunity of speaking to Lord Liverpool on this subject. His opinion of Walter Scott is, I am sure, what it ought to be, but a greater number of baronets having been made during his Administration than within the same period of time, in the present, or any former reign, he dreads re-opening a door which, if opened at all, must be so to very many as he does [*sic*], adding any name, however respectable, to a list already overloaded.

I beg you to consider what has pass'd between us, on this subject, as strictly confidential: it shall not be long before you hear from me again.

Be assured, my dear Lord, that I am gratified by the unreserv'd communication of your sentiments on this occasion: founded, as it is, upon your conviction of my high opinion of the person in question, as well as of the esteem and regard with which I truly am, [&c.]

(P.R.O., H.O. 102/29/62.)

Viscount Sidmouth to William Adam.

Richmond Park, Nov^r ye 27th, 1818. Private.

(Copy.)

My dear Lord,

I am shock'd at the date of your letter, though immediate attention was paid to the principal subject of it. Lord Liverpool was apprized of it without any delay, and I took the first opportunity of mentioning it to Lord Melville. Your Lordship need not be assured of the high sense which they entertain of the pretensions of Mr. Walter Scott to a distinguished mark of the royal favor, and I must be permitted to add that it could not exceed my

¹ First Lord of the Admiralty. He appears to have been usually consulted on questions of Scottish patronage.

own. It is a great satisfaction to me to be now enabled to inform your Lordship that it is the intention of Lord Liverpool to recommend it to the Prince Regent to confer upon Mr. Walter Scott the dignity of a baronet of the United Kingdom, and that the distinction will be announced *singly* in the *Gazette*. I am not authorized to name a time when it will take place, but I have no doubt that, if he were to visit London, it would be conferr'd without further delay. It is, however, Lord Liverpool's wish that it should be deferr'd for a few months, and it may not perhaps be inconvenient to Mr. Walter Scott to afford his friends in this quarter the pleasure of seeing him in the course of the spring.¹ You will understand that I write under instructions, and no purpose would be answer'd by my troubling your Lordship with explanations.

I earnestly hope that your health is perfectly re-established. My own is tolerably good, but I feel the effects of time and long service as well as of these dispensations which it is a duty to bear with patience and fortitude, though they could not fail to make a deep and lasting impression.²

(P.R.O., H.O. 102/29/173.)

It may be worth while to add that William Adam's letter to the Prince Regent has not, apparently, been preserved; at any rate, it is not amongst the George IV Papers in the Royal Archives at Windsor Castle. A copy of it, however (and perhaps other relevant documents) may yet be found in the manuscripts at Blair Adam. There may be something, too, in the Papers of Lord Liverpool (British Museum Additional MSS.), but these are still inaccessible as a result of the war.

A. ASPINALL.

MATTHEW ARNOLD AND THE *SATURDAY REVIEW*

In a recent study of the *Saturday Review* as edited by John Douglas Cook, Dr. M. M. Bevington gives a full account of its battle with Matthew Arnold on the question of British Philistinism.³ He concludes his narrative with the remark that during the last two years of Cook's life his paper showed Arnold less hostility than previously. Two reviews published in the *Saturday* shortly after Dr. Bevington's terminal date (1868), and therefore unmentioned by him, illustrate the persistence of this less hostile tone. In addition, they point to a partial explanation of it.

The reviewer of *Culture and Anarchy* (1869)⁴ may well have been Arnold's old opponent, J. Fitzjames Stephen. At all events, he repeats Stephen's favourite complaint⁵ that Arnold, in criticizing actual political

¹ Illness prevented Scott from going to London in the spring of 1819 to receive the honour, and consequently the announcement in the *Gazette* was postponed until March 1820.

² This evidently refers to the death of his brother, John Hiley Addington, Under-Secretary of State for Home Affairs, on 11 June 1818.

³ M. M. Bevington, *The Saturday Review 1855-1868* (New York, 1941), pp. 136-52.

⁴ *Saturday Review*, vol. XXVII (6 March, 1869), pp. 318-9.

⁵ See *S.R.*, vol. XVIII (3 December, 1864), pp. 683-5, and vol. XIX (25 February, 1865), pp. 235-6.

measures, is behaving inconsistently with his professions of disinterestedness. Arnold's criticism of such practical matters is held to be amateurish: his 'vague, unregulated, unscientific play of consciousness . . . is Hellenism made uncommonly easy'. The reviewer assures Arnold that he will more successfully persuade his readers to 'follow culture' if he returns to strictly literary criticism, to works on education, and to poetry.

These strictures occupy the final two-thirds of the article. In the first paragraph, much is admitted in Arnold's favour. The writer believes that, considering how recently he came forward as a 'social philosopher', Arnold's influence has been very considerable.

We all of us, or nearly all of us at any rate, agree that Mr. Arnold has done a thoroughly good bit of work in familiarizing the English reader with clever nicknames for personages who were already only too familiar to him . . . ; that he has done a great deal by way of beginning towards cleaving the ugly block of national conceit, not in national excellences but in national defects; and that he has decidedly quickened and stimulated intelligence among many of the most important of those who ultimately form public opinion. Yet somehow we seem to feel that we now know all that he has got to tell us in this order.

For too long now, the reviewer continues, we have heard him blaming in his irritatingly mannered way our disrespect for intelligence and effective organization. As a social philosopher, Arnold is 'played-out'.

Whether Arnold agreed with this or not, he certainly directed his attention, for some years from about 1870 onwards, mainly towards religious criticism. In 1871, however, he republished *My Countrymen* and his subsequent letters to the *Pall Mall Gazette* in a single volume under the title *Friendship's Garland*. The *Saturday* reviewer of this¹ deliberately refrains from reopening the old controversy; he has 'no desire to pursue the quarrel further'. He prefers to 'take credit' because his paper has been 'in some degree the cause of . . . [Arnold's] pungent assault upon our insular peculiarities'. He recognizes, without the patronizing tone of his predecessor, that Arnold has done much 'to help on that fit of general discontent which, we may hope, will lead to some important reforms'. While differing from him on many issues, he is 'not on the whole inclined to find fault' with him when he says that the English are 'stupid, self-centred, and, at the present moment, in a very anarchical condition. . . . There are times when a bitter draught may be highly medicinal.'

But he is not amused by what he considers to be the distinctly heavy-handed humour of Arnold's exchanges with Arminius and the rest. In this connection, he refers to Arnold's followers. 'We imagine that some of

¹ *S.R.*, vol. XXXI (11 March, 1871), pp. 314-5. The review is unlikely to have been the work of Stephen, who was in India by this time (Leslie Stephen, *The Life of Sir James Fitzjames Stephen* (London, 1895), p. 237.)

Mr. Arnold's admirers will be pleased with *Friendship's Garland*, he writes, adding impatiently, 'as they would be pleased with anything that Mr. Arnold wrote.' It is interesting to learn that even Arnold was accused of inspiring that sort of devotion.

The less resentful tone of these reviews as compared with those written before 1867 can be ascribed in part to the fact that Arnold had now 'got his public'.¹ The *Saturday* testifies that his social criticism was having a considerable general effect and had inspired in particular a number of fervent admirers. Two years later, these reappear as 'disciples' in a review of *Literature and Dogma* (1873).² This public must have been drawn mainly from the educated classes—so much is obvious even without the reminder that *Essays in Criticism* (First Series, 1865) had been no best-seller;³ and these were the classes to which the *Saturday* itself appealed and by members of which it was written. In the circumstances, a change of tone was natural. It amounts to an admission that Arnold's ideas—whether individual reviewers agreed with them or not—had begun to tell. Arnold himself was aware that this was so. From about 1868 onwards, he began to comment, at first with surprise, upon the 'favourable reception' given to his views⁴ and upon the speed with which his nicknames and slogans were catching on.⁵ Even contributors to the *Saturday*—for example, John Morley in his famous review of Swinburne's *Poems and Ballads*⁶—had started to use the label 'Philistine'. So widely known were these catch-words by 1881 that Disraeli was able in that year to compliment Arnold on being the only living Englishman who had become a classic in his own lifetime.⁷

J. D. JUMP.

¹ *S.R.*, vol. XXVII (6 March, 1869), p. 319.

² *S.R.*, vol. XXXV (1 March, 1873), pp. 284-6.

³ Charles Morgan, *The House of Macmillan* (London, 1943), p. 77.

⁴ *Letters of Matthew Arnold 1848-1888* (London, 1895), vol. I, p. 392.

⁵ *Ibid.*, vol. I, p. 394.

⁶ *S.R.*, vol. XXII (4 August, 1866), pp. 145-7.

⁷ *Letters of Matthew Arnold 1848-1888*, vol. II, pp. 188-9.

CORRESPONDENCE

TIMON OF ATHENS

THE EDITOR, *Review of English Studies*.

DEAR SIR,

Reading Mr. A. S. Collins' recent article in the *Review of English Studies* on *Timon of Athens*, I could not help being aware that the general approach, together with a number of the dominant ideas, corresponded closely with those contained in a book I published in 1930: *The Wheel of Fire* (Oxford University Press). As Mr. Collins specifically states, with reference to many contemporary scholars, that no recent writer has defended the play, might I be allowed to call attention to my own contribution?

Yours faithfully,

G. WILSON KNIGHT.

REVIEWS

Beowulf in Modern Verse with an Essay and Pictures. By GAVIN BONE.
Oxford: Basil Blackwell. 1946. Pp. x+84. 15s. net.

Gavin Bone was a poet as well as a scholar; which is a different thing from a scholar who understands about metres. Before undertaking his translation he must have spent a long time in experiment, and in pondering existing verse-forms. Consequently we have here that rare phenomenon, a rendering of *Beowulf* which is primarily a poem.

Bone, outdoing Chapman, whose choice of the fourteener was a stroke of genius triumphantly vindicated by practice, evolved, and rightly evolved, his own verse-form—a quatrain with regularly alternating rimes but with lines varying widely in length. The effect is, as the author would have had it, to make one only occasionally conscious of the rimes, and yet they are always there to pull the reader up when he begins to treat the poem as prose, and to remind him of the greater attentiveness required by poetry.

The form is perhaps his finest achievement, for it gives scope for his other virtues. He knows—what translators who are not poets never understand—that verse-movement depends less on a set rhythmic pattern than on syntactical structure. He has contrived, while writing intelligibly, to convey most movingly the pattern of the Anglo-Saxon sentence, which is the despair of the neophyte and the constant joy of the initiated;

To Higelac, if battle have me, send
What is on my breast—these steely clothes,
Best armour in the world, which from Hraedla did descend,
The work of Weland. Fate goes as it goes.

This has the sparseness, the typical inversion, and above all the finality of cadence of the original; yet it is written without constraint or self-conscious seeking after archaic atmosphere. But the freedom of the form inevitably introduces one alien element, an element of restlessness. For all its 'fire' *Beowulf* is a restful poem. This quality is achieved through the clichés, the kennings, and the formal descriptions, which afford not only breathing spaces for the extemporizing poet, but points of repose (*within* the verse paragraph) for the audience as well. In rendering

wisse he gearwe
þæt him holtwudu helpa ne meahte,
lind wið lige

Bone's version:

For he knew well that wood could not perform
Aught against fire

has kept the structure and the simplicity, but misses inevitably the repose of the last commonplace.

This is not meant as derogation: apart from the Ballads and the Old Testa-

ment, Modern English poetry has no such points of rest. A more regular pattern would have come nearer to reproducing their effect, but every translator must surrender something, and in using the freer form Bone gained more than he lost.

He has sought to make his language 'bold and vigorous': the shark which attacked Beowulf 'soused And tugged me down to bottom', Grendel approaches through the 'scuggy night'. And here it should be said that in the first instance judgement on this translation as a whole should not be passed by the student of Anglo-Saxon. I have lent it to two friends who could not read the original. Both found it fascinating, and each independently singled out this quality in the diction of homeliness mingled with surprise. That it happens to be the outstanding quality of Old English poetic diction in general and of *Beowulf* in especial should be proof enough that this translation has succeeded where so many others have failed.

Had he lived to revise his work, Bone would not, I trust, have greatly altered his rendering. About the Introduction, however, there is an air of slight truculence which, I feel sure, sprang from an over-anxiety not to sail under false colours, and which, when he saw that his work was good in its own right, he might have softened. From the Introduction one would gather that the characteristic both of the original and of the translation was violence and toughness. When one turns to the works themselves it is evident that they are both primarily the products of conscious art.

I have not quoted at length because the poem should be read as a whole. This *Beowulf* is an event in English letters. We can only grieve that the author did not live to see his work made public.

NORMAN CALLAN.

Nicholas Udall's '*Roister Doister*'. Ed. from the Eton Copy with Biographical and Literary Introduction and Notes, by G. SCHEURWEGHS. ('Materials for the Study of the Old English Drama', N. S. xvi.) Louvain: Lib. Univ. Uystpruyt. 1939. Pp. lxxxiv+132.

This volume is the last to come to hand in the New Series of the original *Materialen* edited by W. Bang until 1914 and resumed under the above title by H. de Vocht in 1927. The work presented here is the first contribution to the study of Nicholas Udall's work planned by Bang at the beginning of the century, interrupted, as the dedication informs us, first by other studies and then by the war of 1914-1918, and transmitted through de Vocht to the present editor. Though the original plan has been twice tragically interrupted, the critical material in the present volume has not been superseded in any important particular since its appearance in 1939 and may thus stand as the final statement, up to the present date, of our knowledge on Udall's life and on the problems connected with *Roister Doister*.¹ All modern editions, up to and including W. W. Greg's for the Malone Society in 1935, have been noted and recorded in the Introduction.

G. Scheurweghs' reprint reproduces the unique sixteenth-century copy (lacking the title-page) upon which the previous editions have of necessity been based, giving the details as accurately as possible and adding textual notes on readings rendered doubtful in the original edition by indistinctness of printing, smudging

¹ H. Chitty's suggestion as to Udall's parentage (*T.L.S.*, July 22, 1939) was included at the last moment in a prefatory note (p. x) and no discovery or evidence affecting the play has been recorded since.

or blotting, or offering clear evidence of misprinting. To these are added explanatory notes on such matters as grammar, orthography and the printer's technique, a list of proverbial sayings and expressions in the play and an index of words 'which seem interesting for their form or their use'. These are in turn supported by an introductory section on the copy and on certain specific problems such as those offered by the stage directions.

Apart from this bibliographical matter, the Introduction (pp. xi-lxxxiv) is concerned mainly with the biography of Udall, incorporating the results of all recent research and adding the full text of Udall's letter to Sir Thomas Wriothesley (Cott. MS. Titus B. viii) and a reproduction of the autograph of f. 386; with a detailed consideration of all the evidence for the date of the play and the conclusion that it is 'as near by 1552 as possible'; with its relations to the sources, the *Eumuchus* of Terence and the *Miles Gloriosus* of Plautus, in the first instance, the *Phormio* of Terence offering a subsidiary contribution. The relevant quotations from Terence and Plautus are set out at length with references to the corresponding passages in *Roister Doister*.

Little addition to our knowledge of the life of Udall can be expected, but Scheurweghs is able to identify the long autograph letter in which Udall thanks (with a lively sense of favours to come) an unknown patron or benefactor who has attempted to restore him to the headmastership of Eton after his dismissal in 1541. The editor is convinced that 'the unnamed addressee is, without doubt, Sir Thomas Wriothesley; for Udall mentions Titchfield as the place of residence of his protector' and adds the evidence for Sir Thomas's possession of the Abbey.

The story of Udall's life can now be told in some detail; his school and college career; his degrees; his career as a teacher, first perhaps in the north and then in London; his friendship with John Leland; his appointment as headmaster of Eton in 1534; the supervising of plays there; his admission as vicar at Braintree in 1537; his dismissal from Eton in 1541; his (by now) chronic financial embarrassment; his work in London from 1545 to 1552, the probable date of *Roister Doister*; his increasing reputation as a writer and translator; his appointment as prebendary at Windsor in 1551 and as rector of Calbourne in 1554; his connection with the Court theatre during the reign of Queen Mary and his appointment, just before his death, as master of 'St. Peter's Grammar School, annexed to Westminster Abbey'.

The biographical matter is set out in detail with exhaustive reference and full documentation.

UNA ELLIS-FERMOR.

A Check List of English Plays 1641-1700. Compiled by GERTRUDE L. WOODWARD and JAMES G. McMANAWAY. Chicago: The Newberry Library. 1945. Pp. x+155. (No price given.)

Apart from the *C.B.E.L.* there are not many general bibliographies of books published after the year 1640. The output became so great that unless bibliographies of individual authors or of particular subjects exist it is often difficult to find a record in print of the editions of a book that interests one. Donald G. Wing's *Short Title Catalogue of English Books 1641-1700* will do much to remedy the want, but so far only the first volume has appeared. This check list of plays is therefor of much value. Mr. Montague Summers produced a useful *Biblio-*

graphy of the *Restoration Drama* (undated) some years ago, but it was not compiled with the fulness of this volume and the edition was limited to 250 copies. The present book is an excellent piece of work. Miss Woodward and Dr. McManaway have used material from catalogues and bibliographies collected by Miss Jane D. Harding when she was a member of the Newberry Library staff. Fifteen other American libraries have contributed and the list was finally merged with a similar list of Civil War and Commonwealth plays undertaken by the Folger Shakespeare Library. The result is a list of editions and issues which is not far from complete. There are omissions, although, after comparing the list with my own collection of about 100 plays of the period, I can only add the very rare *Cataclysm* with plates mentioned below.

The book contains 1340 entries and a supplement. Editions or issues of the same date are distinguished by transcriptions of so much of the title-pages as is necessary for the purpose, or, if this does not suffice, the collations or other distinguishing features are given. The compilers use the term 'issue' rather loosely, and do not confine it to its strict bibliographical meaning. The American locations are given with an occasional English location. The compilers state in their preface that 'three fourths of the 1340 separate items are available to scholars in each of two libraries in America, the Folger and Huntington, and more than half of them in each of two others, Harvard and Yale'. Where bibliographies, such as W. W. Greg's *List of English Plays Written before 1643 and printed before 1700* or my own *Dryden Bibliography* (with Mr. James M. Osborn's notes thereon) exist, reference is made to them. The compilers wisely include some older works such as W. C. Hazlitt's *Handbook* and Lowndes' *The Bibliographer's Manual* in their 'Bibliographical Citations'. As they are well aware, a check-list is not a substitute for a bibliography, though it is the natural basis for one. The Restoration dramatists carried on numerous quarrels, critical, political and personal, sometimes in the plays themselves, but more often in the prefaces or dedications. These are frequently more interesting than the plays to which they were added. Occasionally prefaces were cancelled and, of course, one wants to know if a particular copy contains the preliminary matter or not. The best-known example of cancellation is in the case of the second edition of *The Indian Emperor* (1668). After publication Dryden presumably considered that he had irritated his brother-in-law, Sir Robert Howard, enough. So only some copies contain 'A Defence'. The libraries possessing copies with 'A Defence' are distinguished in the *Check List* from the libraries having copies without it. But no reference is made to the preface to Settle's *Ibrahim* (1677). This gives an account of Settle's quarrel with Shadwell. It was printed on signature 'a'. The only copy known to me which contains the preface is in the British Museum (C. 57. i. 50). The bibliographical relationship between Ecclestone's *Noah's Flood* (1679), *The Cataclysm* (1685) and *The Deluge* (1690) is correctly given, but no mention is made of the fact that a few copies of *The Cataclysm* contain six plates. The addition of plates and the changes in the title were, I suppose, for the purpose of tempting the public to buy copies.

The year 1700 necessarily excludes a few 'Restoration' quartos, but perhaps no other date of conclusion would have been more convenient. This book is essential to all who are interested in the drama of the time and to all librarians and cataloguers.

HUGH MACDONALD.

From Virgil to Milton. By C. M. BOWRA. London: Macmillan & Co. Ltd. 1945. Pp. viii+248. 15s. net.

This book, as the author says, 'is a study of the literary epic in four of its chief examples, and especially of certain characteristics which seem to belong to this kind of poetry'. The four authors are Virgil, Camões, Tasso and Milton. A literary historian could not desire a better defined or more important subject; and the story of this great phase of European poetic art has never been told more clearly and satisfactorily. The one general criticism that may be brought against Mr. Bowra is that he is too intent, as it is difficult for literary historians not to be, on making a water-tight case of his subject; that he is apt to define too sharply, and that from the outset he differentiates too absolutely in presenting the fashionable view that the Homeric epic is one thing and the Virgilian epic that ends with Milton quite another—and for Christendom perhaps a more acceptable—thing. He starts from the familiar distinction between 'authentic' or 'oral' and 'literary' epic—for which perhaps 'primary' and 'secondary' are better terms as being simply ordinal expressions that beg no questions. After considering differences in technique he finds the fundamental difference between the two types of epic to be a different conception of the heroic. Virgil adapts the Homeric hero, along with all the themes and devices of the Homeric poem, to a more civilized conception of man's worth and place in the universe. The Homeric hero lives and dies for his personal glory, the Virgilian hero for Rome. This means that Virgil created not only the national epic but something much larger in scope and significance; for the vision presented in the *Aeneid* of the Roman character, and of Roman history as the fulfilment of a long divinely ordered process, implies a morality, a philosophy, a religion, a high seriousness that are wanting in Homer. Camões, Tasso and Milton, each in his own way, follow in the steps of Virgil: Camões' subject is Portugal and her mission in the world; Tasso as a child of the Counter-Reformation tells the story of the struggle of Christianity against Islam; Milton, rising to the height of the argument, tells the story not of a nation or a cause but of Man.

One could assent to this interpretation and to these distinctions if Mr. Bowra did not press them so hard: in order to distinguish it is not necessary to divide. The development of the epic, even on Mr. Bowra's showing, is a continuous one, and from the poetic point of view there is no such gulf between Homer and Virgil (the gulf between barbarism and civilization) as the fashionable view represented by Mr. Bowra would seem to assume. His argument leads him to assert, for example, that Virgil is instructive, didactic, as Homer is not: surely the Greeks would not have agreed to this view of their poet! It is true that Virgil was the first to adapt the Homeric epic to the expression of a new age and outlook, and that the world of the Roman Empire he interprets is nearer in character as in time to the Renaissance world of his successors; but it is true that the latter, as Mr. Bowra argues, built simply on Virgil? It is not, I think, true of Milton; he regarded Homer, Virgil and Tasso in their proper sequence—'that Epic form whereof the two poems of Homer and those other two of Virgil and Tasso are a diffuse . . . model'. Moreover Milton was as consciously revolutionary in handling this traditional form as ever Virgil was; on that crucial question of the heroic ideal, the difference between *Paradise Lost* and the *Aeneid* is perhaps greater than between the *Aeneid* and the *Iliad*.

A final distinction Mr. Bowra draws between 'authentic' and 'literary' epic is that the latter flourishes not in the heyday of a nation or a cause but in its

decline or aftermath; these poets are conscious that the greatness and glory they proclaim is passing or gone; they are poets of periods of transition. But is not this also true of Homer, that he is celebrating a heroic age already in the past? And is there any period of history that cannot be or for that matter has not in fact been called an age of transition? This then can hardly be accepted as the cause of the melancholy which Mr. Bowra finds a distinguishing characteristic of his four poets. He is drawn on by his argument to use these criteria to determine which periods are propitious to literary epic. For contrast he cites the Elizabethan period among others as a time when men dwelt with pride and excitement on the brilliant present and saw it big with promise for the future; such periods, he says, have their own superb literatures but no literary epic. Yet nothing is more characteristic of Elizabethan literature in its maturity than the melancholy and the brooding thought Mr. Bowra finds propitious to the production of literary epic. He is rather given to this hazardous game of explaining poetry by historical and biographical references. Thus he remarks that Milton 'made Adam and Eve an example of connubial bliss and displayed in them that happiness which he had failed to find in his own first marriage'. What use is the biographical reference here except to spoil the poetry?

But enough of grumbles. Though a reader may differ from the author on special points he must be impressed by the strength and clarity of the general treatment, and above all by the masterly expositions of his four great epics. In the fine chapter on Virgil he shows us the working of that compassionate and sensitive mind, bringing out the qualities that have made Virgil the most loved and revered of poets. There is in particular the passage on Virgil's view of war as 'a chaos of horror and muddle', which culminates in the analysis of the character of Turnus. Turnus, says Mr. Bowra, is Virgil's portrait of the warrior type, the older Homeric hero; the poet shows that he both understands and admires the type even while he knows that it is no longer what the world needs. But—and here comes in the true Virgilian touch—he not only admires but deeply feels with Turnus; his story, like that of Dido, is told as a tragedy. The poem itself ends, as Mr. Bowra observes, not in triumph at the victory of Aeneas and the Roman cause but with lamentation for the great spirit of Turnus sent to an untimely death. Nothing could illustrate better the pity and understanding, the humane wisdom which is the abiding appeal of Virgil. There is no space to comment on Mr. Bowra's treatment of Camões and Tasso, beyond remarking that he has done a service by giving prominence to *Os Lusíadas* and to Fanshawe's seventeenth-century translation of it. His treatment of *Paradise Lost* makes a worthy climax to the book. As always his criticism is comprehensive but direct. He goes straight to the main story of the poem, and by that one stroke cuts away the perversities with which its criticism is overlaid. 'Milton's subject is the Fall of Man; Adam is his central figure, and, in the literary sense, his hero.' By the time he has taken us through Milton's story of Adam and Eve the true shape and purport of the epic are established, and he can turn to consider the superhuman figures and scenes without danger of distorting Milton's own perspective. One may disagree with Mr. Bowra on this or that point, but the truth of his exposition stands; here as elsewhere he demonstrates that in criticism it is the approach and the right lines of treatment that matter.

B. A. WRIGHT.

Byron's 'Don Juan': A Critical Study. By ELIZABETH FRENCH BOYD. New Brunswick: Rutgers University Press, 1945. Pp. x+193. \$3.50.

The Flowering of Byron's Genius: Studies in Byron's 'Don Juan'. By PAUL GRAHAM TRUEBLOOD. California: Stanford University Press; London: Oxford University Press, 1945. Pp. xii+183. \$2.50; 15s. 6d. net.

How great a poem is *Don Juan*? Considering the acres of paper that have been used up by critics and biographers of Byron since his death, it might be supposed that his countrymen, at any rate, would have long since made up their minds. And perhaps there has not been much excuse since, say, 1912, when Oliver Elton wrote his enthusiastic yet judicious chapter in the *Survey of English Literature 1780-1830*, for not recognizing that *Don Juan* is 'the greatest, because the freest and the richest, of Byron's writings'. Yet neither before nor after that date has *Don Juan* been studied as closely as might have been expected. There is certainly room for a scholarly critical study of the poem in all its multifarious aspects.

Of the two works under notice, Mr. Trueblood's cannot, I fear, be said to fill the gap. It is a painstaking compilation which attempts little beyond summarizing material for the most part already easily accessible; and its main contention, that during the process of composition Byron's purpose changed 'from sportive satire to serious social criticism', is neither very striking in itself nor very cogently argued.

Miss Boyd's book, however, is another matter. Though deficient in one important respect, to be noticed later, it is full, competent, and clearly planned and written. Beginning with a workmanlike account of the circumstances of the composition of *Don Juan*, she deals in turn with its epic qualities of structure and characterization, its style, the themes of its satire, and its literary background. Chapter 4, discussing the poem's immensely varied style under the title 'Don Juanism', owes a considerable debt (duly acknowledged) to Mr. R. D. Waller, whose long introduction to his edition (1926) of J. H. Frere's *The Monks and the Giants* first showed fully how much Byron owed to Frere and, through him, to Pulci and the other Italian 'medley' poets. In Chapter 6 an interesting though inevitably inconclusive attempt is made to estimate the range and depth of Byron's reading from the evidence not only of the letters, journals, and poems, but of the sale catalogues of his books printed in 1816 and 1827. Perhaps the most successful and original parts of the book are the chapters dealing with the 'background material' of the incidents and ideas in the poem. While demonstrating with almost superabundant fullness upon what numerous and varied works Byron nourished his mind during the five years that *Don Juan* was on the stocks, Miss Boyd keeps a wary eye for the pitfalls that await the mere source-hunter. To give one instance among many, she is careful to note that the famous shipwreck scene in Canto II owes as much to an experience of Byron's own (in 1809) as to Dalzell's *Shipwrecks and Disasters at Sea* and the other works of which he made such profitable use. Her remarks in the last chapter on why, although Canto XVI was finished a year before Byron's death, the poem remains a fragment are an excellent example of her sympathy and penetration when she is at her

Neither Miss Boyd nor Mr Waller, however, quite does justice to W. S. Rose, whose verse epistle to Byron in *ottava rima*, sent only a few months before *Don Juan* was begun, is as close to its manner as anything of Frere's. See Byron's *Letters and Journals*, ed. Prothero, IV, pp. 212-4.

best. Byron, she points out, had to choose between Juan's continuing to 'drift towards disaster' and maturing in character so as to become fit to play the role of a 'hero of liberty'. This decision the poet was not yet ready to make; he had not lived long enough, he lacked the experience in 'positive moral action' in the conduct of his own life. He had lived to finish *Don Juan*, its fundamental moral seriousness might never have been open to question.

It cannot, unfortunately, be said that the contemporary political background of the poem is adequately dealt with by Miss Boyd—much less by Mr. Trueblood. Neither seems clear on the true nature of political and personal satire, which is, of course, always and essentially *caricature*; *Don Juan*, therefore, could not be, and ought not to be expected to be, a *historically* true picture of the age or of the individuals satirized. No doubt most readers of any work of literary criticism would know well enough that Byron was unjust to Wordsworth, Coleridge, and Southey; but it is hard on Castlereagh, Wellington, and Lord Eldon that Byron's ferocious attacks on them should be itemized without any indication that apologists for their good intentions and even their political sagacity are not lacking among modern historians. It seems a pity that neither Miss Boyd nor Mr. Trueblood thought of looking into Sir Charles Webster's *Foreign Policy of Castlereagh* (1925), or even R. W. Chambers's excellent though slight and rather unsuitably-named paper, 'Ruskin (and others) on Byron', in his volume of essays *Man's Unconquerable Mind* (1939). There seems here to be a two-fold moral: one, that students of literature can never afford to disdain the help of students of history; and two, that the old saying, 'there is right on both sides', is just as true to-day as it was in the time of Castlereagh and Byron.

R. W. KING.

Hawthorne the Artist: Fine-Art Devices in Fiction. By LELAND SCHUBERT. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press; London: Oxford University Press, 1944. Pp. xii + 181. \$3.50; 21s. 6d. net.

Mr. Schubert's title gives us fair warning of what we are to expect in his account of Hawthorne: Hawthorne is to be considered as an artist in the sense that composers, painters, sculptors are artists; we are to observe and study Hawthorne's use of these 'fine-art devices' common to all the arts. For the novelist's aims are those of other artists, and so are the devices he uses to attain them; only the medium is different. An old controversy lies behind this book. And Mr. Schubert fails at the very beginning—and it is a failure that cripples his whole study—to give adequate and convincing reasons for his belief that we can discuss 'rhythm' in a work of fiction in the same terms as rhythm in music, or 'colour' in a prose description as though it were colour in a landscape by Claude or Cézanne.

Mr. Schubert's principles when put into practice issue for the most part in observations that are on the most elementary level, in the piling up of details that lack significance. Only too often Mr. Schubert is merely telling us that Hawthorne has chosen to describe certain incidents and scenes. Flames are described by Hawthorne as rising, and so are mountains, when they are seen from the plains—it would be odd if they were not. Hawthorne chooses to emphasize the colour red here, or purple there. So far, so good. But such details as observed and enumerated by Mr. Schubert are meaningless: only a study of the total intention, the total meaning of the story in which they appear can give them significance. And such study the author rigorously eschews. He is concerned with 'form' only and not with 'content'. Thus he will talk of 'rhythmic

motifs' but not of 'symbols', because to talk of 'symbols' would involve the discussion of meaning; and I cannot see what good it does to talk of the scarlet letter as a 'rhythmic motif' and not as a symbol.

If Mr. Schubert had chosen to write a different book he would probably have written a better one. His chapter on *The Scarlet Letter* shows that he could have contributed something valuable to our understanding of Hawthorne if he had not based his approach on principles that are rigid, tiresome, and, at best, dubious.

D. J. GORDON.

An Exhibition of Printed Books at the University of Texas, October 19-December 31, 1945. Described by AUTREY NELL WILEY. Jonathan Swift: 1667-1745. 1945. Pp. 48. \$1.00.

The bicentenary of Swift's death fell on 19 October, 1945. The occasion was marked by exhibitions, gatherings of scholars, and commemorative lectures in this country, in Ireland, in the United States of America, and even in Russia. In England there was an exhibition at the Old Schools, Cambridge; in Ireland in the library of Trinity College, Dublin; in the United States there were exhibitions at the Grolier Club, the Pierpont Morgan library, the Henry E. Huntington library, at the University of Texas, and doubtless elsewhere. Several catalogues, valuable for reference purposes, have been issued; and commendation must be given to that compiled by Miss Autrey N. Wiley, descriptive of the exhibition at the University of Texas.

By good fortune Texas possesses the collections of the late John Henry Wrenn, G. A. Aitken, and Miriam L. Stark, and from these the exhibits in the show cases were chiefly drawn. Professor R. H. Griffith also made some contribution from his library. Miss Wiley's handbook to the exhibition, for it is more than a mere catalogue, is an accomplished, well informed, and thorough compilation. The whole is divided into eight sections, each with its brief introduction, the exhibits named are bibliographically discussed, and copies in other libraries frequently receive mention. Space forbids any comment in detail. If anything, Miss Wiley has been tempted to crowd almost too much into her pages. It is not always quite clear to the reader, who has had no opportunity of scanning the show cases, whether each work named was an exhibit or not. No doubt remains, however, that the exhibition at Texas was of outstanding distinction, containing many rarities, and remarkable in its comprehensiveness. A concluding reference may be forgiven to an edition of *Gulliver's Travels* of no particular value, for the volume contains Wordsworth's bookplate and three pages of comment in Coleridge's handwriting.

HAROLD WILLIAMS.

A Dictionary of American English on Historical Principles. Edited by SIR WILLIAM CRAIGIE and JAMES R. HULBERT. Parts XIV-XX. Chicago: University of Chicago; London: Sir Humphrey Milford. 1944. Pp. 1781-2552. 17s. each part.

American Speech. A Quarterly of Linguistic Usage (Vol. XVIII, No. 2 to vol. XX, No. 3. Columbia University Press. April 1943-October 1945.

In his interesting essay, 'Sidelights on the Dictionary of American English', (*Essays and Studies*, XXX), 1944, Sir William Craigie expresses satisfaction that

'the dictionary has been recognized as having attained the end aimed at, that of displaying as fully as possible both the growth and the riches of American English and its significance for American history'. The bibliography appended to the Dictionary contains over 3,000 titles, some covering many volumes, and when this fact alone is fully grasped the generous scope of the work becomes obvious. It took ten years of steady labour for Sir William Craigie and a large staff to build up from the written records of the language to the year 1900, the Dictionary's 2,552 pages of double columns. This impressive accumulation of careful erudition establishes one fact immediately, the enormous number of current expressions that are American by origin. The New England Town Records proved a fruitful source for the lexicographers, and so conscientiously have they upheld the historical principles on which the Dictionary is compiled that the finished product of their combined efforts may stand as a monument of American history presenting the language as a gradual accretion of words from the main movements and issues of the national life.

It is in its encyclopedic nature, perhaps, that the *D.A.E.* is most valuable and comprehensive, for almost every aspect of American life—from the early days of colonization, through the various wars, through westward pioneering, industrial development and political storms to the establishment of an ordered social pattern—finds a place here, giving a full record of the American mind reflected in its vocabulary. The American idiom has moved a long way from normal English usage but it is still mercifully far from the point of mutual unintelligibility. Unless confronted with accumulative evidence the average English reader is unaware of the impressive independence of the American language. The following lists should indicate something of the extensive variety and interest of American as distinct from its parent stem. Particularly noteworthy are the adoptions from American Indian, Spanish, French, Dutch and German. It will be seen that actual inventiveness is rare except in the case of slang, facetious language, and the picturesque phrase which has the tang and crisp quality we usually associate with the word *American*. The tendency is rather to invent new meanings to describe new experiences:

Country (a) Natural features.

panhandle, pocoson, prairie, rapid, redland, rim rock, rolling prairie, sag, salt lick, savanna, seaboard, sink, sinkhole, slew, slough, swamp, swash, swell, tableland, wallow.

(b) Proper names.

Ohio, Oklahoma, Oregon, Pennsylvania, Rockies, Santa Fe, Saratoga, Texas, Philadelphia, United States, Wall Street, Yosemite, Out West, Porkopolis, Prairie State, Quaker City, Sucker State, purchase, reservation, settlement.

Transport.

plank walk, plank road, pike, post road, railroad, round trip, schooner, smoker, steamboat, truck, prairie schooner (obs.) parlor car, Pullman, packhorse, pack mule, pony express, packet boat, show boat, street car, trolley.

Administration.

overseer, patent office, penitentiary, posse, redemption, tithing man, viewer, vigilante.

Political.

pipelaying, plank, radical, row up Salt River, split ticket, sorehead, Tammany Tycoon, Whig, wirepuller, platform, pork barrel.

Terms of historical interest.

palatine, parish, partisan, Paxton boys, Pinkerton, Pilgrim father, Pope day, popular sovereignty, Race problem, Race riot, Raines Law, Rebel, reconstruct, refugee, regulator, Republican, Secession, Shebang, shoddy, Shoestring District, slaver, slavery, Solid South, Stars and Stripes, Star-spangled Banner, Submissionist, Thanksgiving Day, Tippecanoe, Tory, Union, Unionist, Yankee (the last a model of precise and cautious statement.)

Religious Belief.

platform, prophet, Quaker, quarterly meeting, ranter, saint, seeker, Separate Baptist, Seventh-Day Baptist, Six-Principle Baptist, Soft-Shell Baptist, Shaker, Tunker, Rolling exercise, Temple.

Education.

parietal, polytechnic, prex, Phi Beta Kappa, private school, public school, regent, sophomore, senior, sorority, singing school, spelling school, spelling bee, spelling match, valedictorian.

Games.

outfield, strike out, poker, show-down, skin game, square deal, rounce, tiger, trapball, volley ball.

Names of Persons.

paleface, poor white, poor white trash, octoroon, quadroon, pathfinder, pioneer, planter, rancher, refugee, renegade, residenter, riverman, roustabout, rowdy, scab, settler, slave, squatter, squire, swamper, trapper, usher, voyageur, waiter girl, wench.

Indian tribal names.

Navaho, Pawnee, Pueblo, Sac, Shawnee, Shoshone, Sioux, Ute, Wyandotte.

Commerce and Industry.

petroleum, phonograph, proof-reader, oil, oleomargarine, prospecting, quartz, rubber, telegraph, telephone, variety store, vendue.

Buildings.

shack, shanty, skyscraper, stoop, tepee, tenement house, wigwam.

Currency.

picayune, pistareen, pistole, quarter, scrip, slug, stiver, spondulicks.

Plants and Trees.

palmetto, pawpaw, peanut, pecan, persimmon, poison ivy, poke, pumpkin, scrub oak, sequoia, sumach, tamerack, tupelo, sagebrush, skunk cabbage, Spanish moss, squash, sweet potato, tarweed, timothy grass, tumbleweed.

Animals, birds and fishes.

paint horse or pinto, painter or panther, polecat, opossum or possum, prairie dog, raccoon, quail, pogy or porgy, quinnat, racer, rattlesnake, robin, skunk, sapsucker, scuppaug, squeteague, stone-toter, turkey, vulture.

Cattle raising.

round up, stamping ground, stocker.

Food.

pandowdy, pumpkin pie, parched corn, popcorn, porterhouse steak, roasting ear, sea food, succotash, sweetcorn, slapjack, smearcase, sundae, tortilla, tamale, waffle.

Drink.

peach brandy, pulque, sling, redeye, rotgut, rye, tanglefoot, straight (undiluted).

Colloquial and slang words.

oodles, pard, peeler, pesky, peek, peter, piker, plug-ugly, podunk, puke, punky,

ragtime, rambunctious, red cent, right smart, rile, riley, rip-roaring, rooter, roughneck, saphead, scads, scalawag, scrumptious, shebang, shucks, shyster, sissy, skedaddle, skeesick(s), slapstick, sloony, snoop, sockadolager, splendidous, splurge, square meal, stogy, sucker, tarnal, tarnation, teeter, tenderfoot, tote, tuxedo, Uncle Sam, vamo(o)se, whole hog.

Picturesque Phrases.

to let rip, to row up Salt River, root hog or die, self-made man, shell out, to keep one's shirt on, to shoot off one's mouth, not by a long shot, show-down, by a darned sight, to sit up and take notice, to size up, to sling ink, soft soap, to spread it on thick, to talk turkey, the whole twist and tucking, up and coming, to have a whack at, a whale of a.

Foreign adoptions.

Spanish.

ocotillo, olla, padre, paisano, paloverde, panoche, patio, peon, pinto, placer, plaza, poncho, pronto, pueblo, quirt, ranch, remuda, rio, rodeo, senor, serape, sierra, sombrero, stampede, tamale, tornillo, tortilla, tular, vamo(o)se, vaquero, vigilante.

Indian.

oppossum, papoose, peag, pecan, pemmican, persimmon, potlatch, poke, pone, powwow, punk, roanoke, sachem, sannup, sagamore, saganash, sequoia, seminole, skunk, squash, squantum, squaw, skookum, succotash, sunck, tepee, terrapin, toboggan, tomahawk, totem, wahoo, wampum, woodchuck.

French.

patroon, pelage, picayune, pirogue, plateau, portage, prairie, vachery, voyageur.

Dutch.

olykoek, overslaugh, Paas, Pinkster, scup, Senecas, Santa Claus, schepel, skipple, shout, sleigh, snoop, stiver, stoop, vendue, waffle.

German.

sauerkraut, smearcase, wienerwurst, pretzel.

African.

voodoo, zombi.

Semantic divergence is clearly observable in the following words:

outsider: an Indian assigned to but not remaining within the limits of a reservation.

oven: a tomb above ground (New Orleans).

paddle: to beat.

parchment: diploma.

peach: pretty girl.

peninsula: an island.

people: negro slaves on a plantation (historical).

pin: symbol or emblem of a fraternity.

porridge: slush of ice or snow.

porter: bearer at a funeral.

possibles: belongings of a trapper.

postal: a postcard issued by the Post Office.

postcard: a private mailing card not issued by the Post Office.

punch: to drive cattle.

puncher: cowboy.

privilege: waterfall furnishing power to a mill.

professor: more widely applied than in England, and not necessarily the holder of an endowed Chair.
 promenade: college ball.
 prophet: the founder of the Latter Day Saints, Joseph Smith.
 purgatory: cavern or ravine (New England).
 quiz: oral or written examination.
 rabbit: a hare.
 recess: (1) eating place; (2) cessation from school work.
 refectory: a saloon.
 robin: a large redbreasted thrush.
 root: (1) to work hard; (2) to cheer.
 run: to tease.
 rye: whisky.
 saint: (1) Puritan; (2) Mormon.
 sand: grit (colloq.).
 save: to kill.
 saw: to dupe.
 school: college or university.
 score: to castigate or denounce.
 scratch: (1) to cancel (political); (2) to make for with all speed.
 seal: to marry as a spiritual wife (Mormon).
 seasoning: fever suffered during the first year of settling in a new country.
 sedan: a closed automobile.
 senior: a student in his last year.
 shout: a meeting at which worship is carried on by shouting.
 shower: present-giving party.
 side line: an auxiliary line of goods.
 slip: a long seat or narrow pew in churches (New England).
 squadron: a division of town land.
 star: a policeman.
 stiff: a corpse.
 stripe: (1) political or religious opinion; (2) prison uniform.
 stump: a dare or challenge.
 swamp land: fertile land in a swamp.
 Tory: traitor (historical).
 truck: garden produce.
 Twelve Apostles: the governing body of the Mormon Church.
 twig: to ask to join a fraternity.
 Underground railroad: an informally organized chain of anti-slavery stations for shelter of slaves being conducted or assisted to escape to the free states or Canada (historical).
 woolly: rude, untutored.

There remain some queries. It is difficult to understand the delicate business of omission. It cannot altogether be a matter of dating or of usage, but in some cases, at least, appears to be arbitrary. The Supplement to the *N.E.D.* lists as Americanisms many words which, for reasons best known to the editors, are excluded from the *D.A.E.*

Omissions (the dates are those given by the *N.E.D.* Supplement as the first appearance of the words).

punk, adj.: 1896.

rattler: (1) an energetic or active person, 1893; (2) a long, resounding word, 1865.

receiving station: Post Office. *Boston Almanac*, 1861 (not in *N.E.D.*).

rig: to take to task, rag or tease, 1899.

- ringer: (1) a person attaching himself to a party to which he doesn't belong, one voting in a district where he does not reside; an outsider, 1896. (2) a ringing cheer, 1901.
 (to be a ringer for: to resemble closely, to be the image of, 1900.)
- rip: a burst of laughter, 1855.
 (like rips: to an excessive degree, violently, keenly.)
- rot: to make snow or ice soft by melting or thawing, 1892.
- rough: as verb, 1770, 1845.
- rough house: an uproar, row, disturbance, 1887 (and as verb).
- rubber: to gaze round, 1896.
- rubberneck: a sightseer, 1896.
- samson: a logging term, 1905.
- sand-painting: a craft of the Hopi and Navaho Indians, 1900.
- scag: a cleat, 1874.
- scape: steam from an escape pipe, 1876.
- scrooch, scrouch: to cower, 1882, 1884.
- scroochy, adj.: cowering, 1844.
- scrouging: huge, 1846. Cf. scrouger, *A.E.D.*
- sculptured: used attributively, 1870.
- sea-road: 1893.
- sea-shell: 1871.
- sea-sider: 1870.
- seldomly, adv.: 1886.
- sentimentalist: 1778.
- sericulturist: 1884.
- set back, vb.: to cost so much, n.d.
- share mart: 1870.
- shifty, adj.: 1838.
- shodden, part. adj.: 1829.
- shoeing, noun: 1780.
- shoregoing, adj.: 1846.
- shortened (of flour): 1832.
- shriner: a member of the Order of Nobles of the Mystic Shrine, established 1872.
- sidelangle (of tethering horses): 1660 and 1669.
- simmer down: to calm down, 1889.
- Sims: a medical term, from J. M. Sims, New York gynaecologist, 1813-83.
- sink tooth into: to eat, 1891.
- sixpennies: the larger newspaper establishments, 1840.
- sizzler: sizzling heat or day, 1901.
- skinflinty, adj.: 1886.
- slewed, adj.: in liquor, 1801.
- sloppy: weakly sentimental, 1896.
- sloshy, adj.: 1797.
- slouch-eared: 1855.
- sloughy, adj.: 1704.
- smudge pot: a vessel which contains oil set alight to keep frost from the crops.
- smooth, adj.: excellent, 1893.
- snappy, adj.: of weather, 1889.
- snifty, adj.: disdainful.
- snug up, verb: 1873.
- soak, verb: to charge or tax heavily, 1899.
- sobersided, adj.: 1880.
- sock, verb: to sock a person one, to give him a hard blow, 1845.
- softly, adj.: 1875.
- sore, adj.: 1868.

speak-easy, noun: 1889.
 spiel, noun: 1896.
 spirt, verb: to flare up with anger or excitement, 1854.
 squinting, noun: a sidelong glance or reference, 1855.
 stalled up: snowed up, 1890.
 starty, adj.: fretful, 1861.
 steady, noun: sweetheart, 1900.
 stover, noun: stalks and leaves of maize, 1837.
 Sundayfied: 1870.
 supe, verb: to act as super, 1893.
 supper, verb: 1805.
 swab: a naval officer, 1850.
 swan-dive: swallow-dive, 1898.
 swedge, verb: to go off without paying (nautical), 1897.
 sweetie: sweetheart, 1778.
 swivel-rowlock: 1886, *Encycl. Brit.* refers to it as U.S. invention.
 swizzled: 'tight', 1843.

In addition some differences of definition and dating call for comment:

put-in: *A.E.D.*: turn or place to speak; affair; intrusion.

N.E.D.: something feigned or pretended.

The same quotation, 1902, is used to illustrate both definitions.

road hog: the American origin of this term is not specifically indicated by the *N.E.D.*, which quotes, in illustration, *The Outing*, Dec. 1891. The *A.E.D.*'s quotation is 1898.

roadster: the use of this word for automobile is dated 1908 by the *A.E.D.*

rooter: *A.E.D.*: one who gives enthusiastic support especially to an athletic team. The reviewer's experience at football matches in America would lead her to qualify the definition to: enthusiastic but disciplined support (with deference to the 'cheer leaders').

sedan: *A.E.D.* gives the date 1909 for the appearance of this word for motor car.

search me: dated 1901 in both *N.E.D.* and *A.E.D.*

serape: *N.E.D.*: 1834; *A.E.D.*, 1844.

sit up and take notice: *N.E.D.*, 1889; *A.E.D.*, 1909.

sick: to incite a dog to attack. *N.E.D.* has the earlier date, 1845.

slumgullion: *N.E.D.* gives the senses: servant, representative, 1869. Omitted in *A.E.D.*

University Settlement: *A.E.D.* claims American origin and dates 1892. In 1883 Samuel Barnett read a paper on University settlements at St. John's College, Cambridge.

thunderbird: *A.E.D.* defines: amongst certain Indians a mythical bird supposed to cause thunder. This misses the point. It is met with amongst the Indians of the South West who live in arid regions and it is a good-luck symbol because it is supposed to bring rain.

um hum: *A.E.D.* defines as a colloquial expression of assent. Some years of residence in America taught the reviewer that it could also be used for dissent, according to the stress; cf. the Scottish use of the same interjection to imply doubt.

willies: the 'creeps', 1900. The *A.E.D.* is throughout cautious in venturing etymologies. It may have some connexion with 'willy' dialectal for willow, the traditional badge of grief; and the 'Wilis' of 'Giselle' had a long mythological history.

In conclusion, a study of this work does indeed throw a clear light not only on the development of ideas and culture in the life of the American people but on its national character. Finally, its many euphemisms for stronger expressions

should be noted :—*Sam Hill, I swan, I snum, I van, I vum, tarnation and tarnal*; the appearance of *swearword* as an Americanism in 1883, of *taxdodger*, in 1876, of *titman*, with its hint of English dialect, in 1818—it means the smallest of a litter of pigs—of *tote*, to carry, transport, in 1677, completely independent of the Middle English verb, *tote*, to gaze at; *saleslady*, 1870, against the English *shop-girl*; and the extraordinary reluctance to use the word *woman* in polite speech, a development very much in line with modern Cockney, where it is used effectively as a forcible term of abuse.

Its editors realize that within its present limits the *D.A.E.* is incomplete and very properly suggest that it will form the nucleus for future research. The supplementary volume projected for the first half of the present century might, perhaps, establish more distinctly its criterion of exclusion.

The work of supplementing the *D.A.E.* is being ably furthered by contributors to that lively and stimulating periodical, *American Speech*. Such articles as 'Lexical Evidence from Charles Sealfeld', by James B. Macmillan, 'A Glossary of Railroad Terms', by W. F. Cottrell and H. C. Montgomery, 'Designations for Coloured Folk', by H. L. Mencken, 'Charles Sealsfield's Americanisms', by John T. Krumpelmann, 'Observations on American Colloquial Idiom', by A. R. Dunlap, 'New American Lexical Evidence', by James B. Macmillan, 'Du Pratz's *History of Louisiana*', by John T. Krumpelmann, 'Texas Speech', by Charles H. Hogan, and Ernest S. Clifton's 'Vocabulary of Sam Slick in Texas', should prove valuable to the compilers of the new Supplement. Amongst other articles worthy of notice are J. A. W. Bennett's survey, 'English in New Zealand', Franklin P. Huddle's 'Baseball Jargon', A. H. Sylvester's 'Place-Naming in the Northwest', Thomas A. Sebeck's 'German Travellers and Language in America', H. L. Mencken's 'War Words in England' (he should note that Guinea-pig, defined as a person evacuated or a soldier billeted is a term applied here to persons willing to lend themselves experimentally to medical or scientific research), Leo Spitzer's 'Anglo-French Etymologies', Elliott Dobbie's 'The Word *Commando*', and Otis Ferguson's 'Vocabulary for Lakes, Deep Seas and Inland Waters'. Mr. Byington's *obiter dicta* and the Miscellanies are always a delight and an adventure, and not the least important feature of *American Speech* is its Phonetic Transcripts.

BEATRICE WHITE.

ERRATA

'Is the Devil an Ass?' by S. Musgrove (*R.E.S.*, October 1945, Vol. xxi, page 302):

Page 302, line 2, *for* critics: Professor *read* critics, Professor

Page 302, note 4, *insert* 'Southerly' *before* Australian

Page 310, line 5, *for* whim *read* whine

Page 314, line 9, *for* exalt *read* exult

Page 314, line 23, *for* smoke *read* smoky

SUMMARY OF PERIODICAL LITERATURE

BY KATHLEEN TILLOTSON

THE DURHAM UNIVERSITY JOURNAL, Vol. 38, No. 3, June 1946—

The return of Cleveland: some observations on *The Pirate* (A. Lytton Sells), pp. 69-78.

The relation of Scott's Basil Mertoun to Prévost's Cléveland.

Supplements to the bibliography of Housman and other Housmanniana (G. B. A. Fletcher), pp. 85-93.

Additions and corrections to the classical section of A. S. F. Gow's list of Housman's writings, and three unpublished letters.

E. L. H., Vol. 13, No. 2, June 1946—

'Hail wedded love' (William Haller), pp. 79-97.

A study of Milton's views on marriage.

Donne's obscurity and the Elizabethan tradition (Arnold Stein), pp. 98-118.

The Tempest: a Restoration opera problem (Charles E. Ward), pp. 119-30.

Arguments against Shadwell's authorship and in favour of Betterton's.

Res et verba: words and things (A. C. Howell), pp. 131-42.

A study of the use of this pair of terms in the seventeenth century.

Coleridge on 'Taste' (Howard Hall Creed), pp. 143-55.

ENGLISH STUDIES, Vol. 27, No. 3, June 1946—

'Gyres' in the poetry of W. B. Yeats (A. N. Jeffares), pp. 67-74.

Ex-service men (Frederick T. Wood), pp. 75-6.

See *English Studies*, February 1946, pp. 21-4.

Bibliography (Frederick T. Wood), pp. 88-96.

Books on English literature before 1798 published in 1940-5.

THE HUNTINGTON LIBRARY QUARTERLY, Vol. 9, No. 3, May 1946—

English metrical psalms in the sixteenth century and their literary significance (Hallett Smith), pp. 249-71.

Dryden's *Georgics* and English predecessors (Helene Maxwell Hooker), pp. 273-310.

Dryden's borrowings from several previous translations.

The date of 'Britannia and Rawleigh' (Godfrey Davies), pp. 311-8.

MODERN LANGUAGE NOTES, Vol. 61, No. 5, May 1946—

Falstaff uncolted (Harry Levin), pp. 305-10.

Deirdre in England (R. M. Smith), pp. 311-5.

Knowledge of the story shown in *The Welsh Ambassador*, c. 1623.

Lowell's 'A Legend of Brittany' (Arthur W. M. Voss), pp. 343-5.

Purpose of revision.

In defence of Butler (Norma E. Bentley), pp. 359-60.

See *M.L.N.*, January 1946, p. 65.

— June 1946—

Hedge's *Prose Writers of Germany* as a source of Whitman's knowledge of German philosophy (Sister Mary Eleanor), pp. 381-8.

The revision of 'My lost youth' (George Arms), pp. 389-92.

A variant of Lowell's 'I go to the ridge in the forest' (Richard Beale Davies), pp. 392-5.

Two songs of Yeats's (Russell K. Alspach), pp. 395-400.

Wordsworth's adaptation of Pliny in 'Laodamia' (Chester L. Shaver), pp. 400-3.

Wordsworth's letter to William Collins, R.A. (Russell Noyes), pp. 403-5.

Shelley's translation from Aristotle (Carlos Baker), pp. 405-6.

Religio Laici and Father Simon's *History* (Charles E. Ward), pp. 407-12.

MODERN LANGUAGE REVIEW, Vol. 41, No. 1, January 1946—

Some textual anomalies in the 1604 *Doctor Faustus* (J. M. Nosworthy), pp. 1-8.

The date of Donne's 'Hymne to God my God, in my sicknesse' (Evelyn M. Simpson), pp. 9-15.

Samuel Johnson and the first roller-spinning machine (John J. Brown), pp. 16-23.

The brothers Grimm and T. C. Croker (John Hennig), pp. 44-54.

Coleridge's parody of Dyer's *Grongar Hill* (Ralph M. Williams), pp. 61-2.

The first French translation of *The Deserted Village* (Edward D. Seeber and Henry H. H. Remak), pp. 62-7.

The name of God in Germanic (A. T. Hatto), pp. 67-8.

— April 1946—

The damnation of Faustus (W. W. Greg), pp. 97-107.

Manuscript material for the study of Tudor and Stuart English (Hilda Hulme), pp. 108-12.

The condition and the value of early church accounts

The death of Walpole: Henry Fielding and a forgotten *cause célèbre* (R. C. Jarvis), pp. 113-30.

Old English whale-hunting (L. Whitbread), p. 196.

'Goode lief my wife' (Ethel Seaton), pp. 196-202.

'It was a lover and his lass': some fresh points of criticism (Edmund H. Fellowes), pp. 202-6.

The castle of the Rosy Cross: Ben Jonson and Theophilus Schweighardt (Percy Simpson), pp. 206-7.

NOTES AND QUERIES, Vol. 190, No. 11, June 1, 1946—

A census of extant collections of English provincial playbills of the eighteenth century (Frederick T. Wood), pp. 222-6.

Additions and corrections by Edmund J. Rees and Francis J. Cooper, June 29, p. 283.

Sir Walter's heraldry (E. A. Greening Lamborn), pp. 226-8.

See *N. & Q.*, May 18, pp. 207-10.

Some unpublished letters of John Gibson Lockhart to John Wilson Croker (Alan Lang Strout), pp. 232-4.

See *N. & Q.*, November 3, 1945, etc.; concluded, June 15, pp. 244-5.

June 15—

Chaucer and Matheolus (Arthur K. Moore), pp. 245-8.

Resemblances to *Wife of Bath's Prologue*.

The noble savage in Mary Shelley's *Frankenstein* (Milton Millhauser), pp. 248-50.

Two versions of Byron's poem, 'Ossian's address to the sun' (Herbert Greenberg), pp. 256-7.

More for the *O.D.Q.* (H.P.H.; J.D.R.; Reginald B. Fellows), pp. 261-2.

Replies to some of the queries in *N. & Q.*, April 20, pp. 169-70.

June 29—

An unpublished letter of the Countess Guiccioli referring to Byron (D. B. Gregor), pp. 266-7.

Miss Lily Campbell and *The Mirror for Magistrates* (F. S. Boas), pp. 267-8.

Scott prototypes: Wandering Willie (James C. Carson), pp. 281-2.

Romantic and romanticism (Fraser MacKenzie), pp. 282-3.

See *N. & Q.*, May 18, p. 213. Further instances of early use of words.

Vol. 191, No. 1, July 13—

The dry tree (Malcolm Letts), pp. 7-8.

Parallels for Mandeville's reference.

July 27—

Plagiarism or parallelism? (D. B. Gregor), pp. 24-6.

Possible source for Byron's *Manfred* in a poem by Vincenzo Monti.

Two notes on *Widsith* (L. Whitbread), pp. 26-7.

The *Paisley Repository*, 1810-11 (J. L. Weir), pp. 31-2.

Bibliographical notes.

P.M.L.A., Vol. 61, No. 2, June 1946—

The religious principle in *Beowulf* (Marie Padgett Hamilton), pp. 309-330.
 Manly's conception of the early history of the *Canterbury Tales* (Germaine Dempster), pp. 379-415.

The marital dilemma in the *Wife of Bath's Tale* (Margaret Schlauch), pp. 416-30.

The allegory of the 'Beare' and the 'Foxe' in Nashe's *Pierce Penilesse* (Donald J. McGinn), pp. 431-53.

The interpretation of Jonson's courtly spectacles (Ernest William Talbert), pp. 454-73.

The 'urbs æterna' in *Paradise Regained* (Samuel Klinger), pp. 474-91.

Players and painted stage—nineteenth century acting (Alan S. Downer), pp. 522-76.

A further note on Una and Duessa (Roland M. Smith), pp. 592-6.

Congreve's first play: addendum (R. G. Floward), pp. 596-7.

See *P.M.L.A.*, December 1943, pp. 971-6; criticism of article.

First American review of Charles Lamb (George Leonard Barnett), pp. 596-600.

Browning and Goldsmith (C. R. Tracy), pp. 600-1.

'Love among the Ruins' and *Citizen of the World* CXVII.

Primordial images (Ananda K. Coomaraswamy), pp. 601-2.

Comment on *P.M.L.A.*, June 1945, pp. 567-85; reply by Genevieve W. Foster.

Language in two recent imaginary voyages (Albert Frank Gegenheimer), p. 603.

See *P.M.L.A.*, June 1945, 586-97. Addenda from C. S. Lewis's novels.

STUDIES IN PHILOLOGY, Vol. 43, No. 2, April 1946—

Renaissance exploitation of Cavendish's *Life of Wolsey* (Paul L. Wiley), pp. 121-46.

Baret's *Alvearie*, an Elizabethan reference book (James Sledd), pp. 147-63.

John Eliot's *Ortho-Epia Gallica* and Du Bartas-Goulart (Chandler B. Beall), pp. 164-73.

Eliot's use of Du Bartas and of Goulart's commentary.

Chapman's early years (Mark Eccles), pp. 176-93.

The Duke of Byron's malignant *caput algol* (Johnstone Parr), pp. 194-202.

The significance of the horoscope in Chapman's *Byron's Conspiracy*.

The citizens in *Philaster*: their function and significance (Mary Grace Muse Adkins), pp. 203-12.

Condemnation of the poetic profession in Renaissance emblem literature (Robert J. Clements), pp. 213-32.

Milton and Selden on divorce (Eivion Owen), pp. 233-57.

Milton on learning (G. F. Sensabaugh), pp. 258-72.

Recent literature of the Renaissance: a bibliography and index (Hardin Craig, general editor), pp. 275-460.

TIMES LITERARY SUPPLEMENT, May 18, 1946—

Matthew Arnold (Hugh Macdonald), p. 235.

Mistakes of Arnold and Wordsworth over botanical fact.

— May 25—

Sir Hugh Walpole (Rupert Hart-Davis), p. 247.

Request for letters.

— June 1—

'Like Images' (M. St. Clare Byrne).

Annotation of *Henry IV*, iv. i. 100.

Keats' Forerunners (Margaret E. O'Brien).

T. J. Wise and H. Buxton Forman: further light on the nineteenth-century pamphlets (John Carter and Graham Pollard), p. 264.

Interpretation of recently published correspondence.

— June 8—

First English laureate (R. Weiss), p. 271.

See *T.L.S.*, May 4, p. 211.

Ruskin at the Lyceum, p. 276.

Letter to Thornton Hunt among accessions at Keats House.

— June 15—

'The youngest wren' (Raymond Chapman), p. 283.

Twelfth Night, iii. ii. 68. Further letters, June 29, p. 307.

June 22—

'A true maid' and 'the sick rose' (E. H. W. Meyerstein), p. 295.

Possible influence of Prior's epigram on Blake.

Eighteenth-century verse (Alan Herrick), p. 295.

Three notes, including a source for Landor's 'Rose Aylmer' and discovery of Cuthbert Shaw's *Four Farthing Candles*.

Thackeray's letters (Gordon N. Ray), p. 295.

Request for further letters.

W. H. Mallock (Charles Madge); Mary Johnston (C. Rose Uttley); Trollope's Letters (Bradford A. Booth); William Diaper (Dorothy Broughton), p. 295.

Requests for information.

June 29—

Shelley and Keats (L. C. Thompson), p. 307.

List of parallels.

The Pisa group (C. L. Cline), p. 307.

Request for information about John Taaffe, friend of Shelley and Byron.

Donne's *Anniversaries* (John Sparrow), p. 312.

Newly discovered errata slip in edition of 1612; list of variants.

July 6—

Sense and Sensibility (R. W. Chapman), p. 319.

Francis Quarles (John Horden); Francis Bacon (R. W. Gibson); James Hurdis (A. P. Whitaker), p. 319.

Requests for information.

July 13—

Harriet Shelley (E. Blunden), p. 331.

Entries in Registers of St. George's, Hanover Square, concerning the Westbrook family.

Black as the Moor of Venice (Robert A. Aubin), p. 331.

A reference to *Othello* in 1689.

Children's games (Godfrey Davies), p. 331.

Query about the meaning of a reference in Dryden's *His Majesties Declaration Defended*.

July 20—

Thackeray at Weimar (Desmond MacCarthy), p. 343.

See *T.L.S.*, July 6, p. 319.

John Donne (H. J. C. Grierson), p. 319.

Comment on article, *T.L.S.*, June 29, p. 312.

John Donne (H. W. Jones), p. 319.

Aubrey's account of 'an extacy'.

July 27—

Mrs. Thackeray (J. A. Waley Cohen), p. 355.

Questions of attribution of portrait in Gordon N. Ray's edition of *Thackeray's Letters*, Vol. 1, p. 350.

INDEX

- Academy, Proceedings of the British*, 1941, reviewed, 152
- Adams, H. H., his *English Domestic or Homiletic Tragedy, 1575-1642* noticed, 156
- Adkins, Mary G. M., article on *The Genesis of Dramatic Satire against the Puritan, as illustrated in 'A Knack to know a Knave'*, 81
- Aelfric: *sermonnaire, docteur et grammairien. Contribution a l'étude de la vie et de l'action bénédictine en Angleterre au Xe siècle*, by Marguerite-Marie Dubois, reviewed, 59
- Æsthetic of Literature, Two Lectures on an*, by B. S. Mardekhar, reviewed, 73
- Æsthetics and Art Criticism, New Bearings in*, by B. C. Heyl, reviewed, 249
- America, Ideas in*, by H. M. Jones, reviewed, 151
- American English, A Dictionary of, on Historical Principles (Parts XIV-XX)*, ed. Sir William Craigie and J. R. Hulbert, reviewed, 334
- American Literature in Nineteenth-Century England*, by C. Gohdes, reviewed, 250
- American Speech* (Vol. XVIII, No. 2 to Vol. XX, No. 3), reviewed, 334
- 'Ancien Rivale', Verbal Repetition in the*, by Agnes M. Humbert, reviewed, 230
- Antony and Cleopatra and the Book of Revelation*, note by Ethel Seaton, 219
- Armstrong, W. A., article on *The Elizabethan Conception of the Tyrant*, 161
- Arnold, M., in *Two Scholarship Examinations*, note by J. P. Curgenven, 54
- Arnold, Matthew, and the *Saturday Review*, note by J. D. Jump, 322
- Aspinall, A., article on *The Circulation of Newspapers in the Early Nineteenth Century*, 29; note on Walter Scott's baronetcy, 319
- Baine, R. M., article on *Rochester or Fishbourne: A Question of Authorship*, 201
- Batho, Edith C., notice by, 157
- Beerbohm, Sir Max: *Bibliographical Notes* by A. E. Gallatin, reviewed, 72
- Bennett, C. H., see Walpole.
- Bentley, Richard, *The Phalaris Controversy: King versus Bentley*, article by C. J. Horne, 289
- Beowulf in Modern Verse*, by G. Bone, reviewed, 326
- Bibliographical Society, Transactions of the, The Library* (Fourth Series, Vol. XXVI), reviewed, 246
- Blanchard, Rae, her *Tracts and Pamphlets by Richard Steele* reviewed, 240
- Bone, G., his *Beowulf in Modern Verse* reviewed, 326
- Boswell, J., *Johnson and Boswell*, by B. H. Bronson, noticed, 75
- Bottomley, G., his ed. *Essays by Divers Hands*, (Vol. XX), reviewed, 153
- Bowra, C. M., his *From Virgil to Milton* reviewed, 330
- Boyd, Elizabeth F., her *Byron's 'Don Juan': A Critical Study* reviewed, 332
- Boyle, the Honourable Robert, *the Life and Works of*, by L. T. More, reviewed, 65
- Bradbrook, M. C., review by, 235
- Bronson, B. H., his *Johnson and Boswell* noticed, 75
- Brown, A. C. L., *The Origin of the Grail Legend*, reviewed, 61
- Budd, F. E., review by, 65
- Butt, J., reviews by, 150, 241; notice by, 75
- Buxton, C. R., his *Prophets of Heaven and Hell. Virgil, Dante, Milton, Goethe* reviewed, 243
- Byron, Lord, *Byron's 'Don Juan': A Critical Study*, by Elizabeth F. Boyd, reviewed, 332; *The Flowering of Byron's Genius: Studies in Byron's 'Don Juan'*, by P. G. Trueblood, reviewed, 332
- Callan, N., article on *Thyn Owne Book: A Note on Chaucer, Gower and Ovid*, 269; reviews by, 137, 248
- Chapman, R. W., article on *Mrs. Piozzi's Omissions from Johnson's Letters to Thrales*, 17; his *Two Centuries of Johnsonian Scholarship* reviewed, 241
- Chaucer, G., *Thyn Owne Book: A Note on Chaucer, Gower and Ovid*, article by N. Callan, 269

- China, *Sir William Jones's Chinese Studies*, article by T. C. Fan, 304
- Church Life in England in the Thirteenth Century, by J. R. H. Moorman, reviewed, 60
- Collins, A. S., article on 'Timon of Athens': *A Reconsideration*, 96
- Collins, William, article by J. M. S. Tompkins on 'In Yonder Grave A Druid Lies', 1
- Colum, Mary M., her *From these Roots. The Ideas that have made Modern Literature*, reviewed, 248
- Corson, J. C., *A Bibliography of Sir Walter Scott*, noticed, 157
- Craig, H., his *Literary Study and the Scholarly Profession* reviewed, 150
- Craigie, Sir William, *A Dictionary of American English on Historical Principles* (Parts XIV-XX), reviewed, 334
- Criticism, *From these Roots. The Ideas that have made Modern Literature*, by Mary M. Colum, reviewed, 248
- Cunningham, W. R., review by, 245
- Curgenven, J. P., note on Matthew Arnold in Two Scholarship Examinations, 54; review by, 64
- Cynewulf, *Les éléments latins dans la poésie religieuse de*, by Marguerite-Marie Dubois, reviewed, 59
- Darbishire, Helen, reviews by, 69, 138
- Davis, B. E. C., notice by, 157
- Donne, J., *John Donne and the Emblematic Practice*, article by J. Lederer, 182
- Drama, *A Check List of English Plays, 1641-1700*, compiled by Gertrude L. Woodward and J. G. McManaway, reviewed, 328; *The Frontiers of Drama*, by Una Ellis-Fermor, reviewed, 144; *English Domestic or Homiletic Tragedy, 1575-1642*, by H. H. Adams, noticed, 156
- Draper, J. W., *The Humors and Shakespeare's Characters*, reviewed, 234
- Dubois, Marguerite-Marie, her *Les éléments latins dans la poésie religieuse de Cynewulf* and her *Aelfric: sermonnaire, docteur et grammairien* reviewed, 59
- Eighteenth Century, Essays on the*, reviewed, 238
- Elizabethan, *The, Conception of the Tyrant*, article by W. A. Armstrong, 161
- Ellis-Fermor, Una, *The Frontiers of Drama* reviewed, 144; reviews by, 234,
- Emblematic Practice, John Donne and the*, article by J. Lederer, 182
- Endymion in England. The Literary History of a Greek Myth*, by E. S. Le Comte, reviewed, 64
- English Institute Annual, 1942*, noticed, 157
- Essays by Divers Hands* (Vol. xx), ed. G. Bottomley; (Vol. xxi), ed. W. de la Mare, reviewed, 153
- Fan, T. C., article on Percy's 'Hau Kiou Chooan', 117; article on *Sir William Jones's Chinese Studies*, 304
- Fishbourne, John, *Rochester or Fishbourne: A Question of Authorship*, article by R. M. Baine, 201
- Fletcher, G. B. A., review by, 72
- Fletcher, H. F., his *John Milton's Complete Poetical Works* (Vol. 1), reviewed, 138
- Ford, John, *The Tragic Muse of*, by G. F. Sensabaugh, reviewed, 235
- Gallatin, A. E., his *Sir Max Beerbohm: Bibliographical Notes* reviewed, 72
- G., M. C., *The Life of George S. Gordon, 1881-1942*, reviewed, 245
- Gnomic Verses, note on the 'Frisian Sailor' passage in the, by L. Whitbread, 215
- Gohdes, C., his *American Literature in Nineteenth-Century England* reviewed, 250
- Gordon, D. J., reviews by, 250,
- Gordon, G. S., his *John Gibson Lockhart* noticed, 251; *The Life of George S. Gordon, 1881-1942*, by M. C. G., reviewed, 245
- Gower, J., *Thyn Owne Book: A Note on Chaucer, Gower and Ovid*, article by N. Callan, 269.
- Grail Legend, The Origin of the*, by A. C. L. Brown, reviewed, 61
- Granville-Barker, H., review by, 144
- Greg, W. W., letter on Shakespeare and Jonson, 58; letter on the staging of *King Lear*, 229; review by, 230
- 'Hamlet', *The Structural Experiment in*, article by J. M. Nosworthy, 282
- 'Hau Kiou Chooan', Percy's, article by T. C. Fan, 117
- Havens, R. D., note on Southey's revision of his *Life of Wesley*, 134
- Hawthorne the Artist: *Fine-Art Devices in Fiction*, by L. Schubert, reviewed, 333
- Heilman, R. B., note on Falstaff and Smollett's *Micklewhimmen*, 226

- Heyl, B. C., his *New Bearings in Aesthetics and Art Criticism* reviewed, 249
- Hildyard, M. C., notice by, 251
- Hodgson, Phyllis, review by, 74; notice by, 251
- Homonyms, in *English*, *The Conflict of*, by Edna R. Williams, reviewed, 74
- Hood, Thomas, *Letters of*, ed. L. A. Marchand, reviewed, 243
- Horne, C. J., article on *The Phalaris Controversy: King versus Bentley*, 289
- Hulbert, J. R., *A Dictionary of American English on Historical Principles* (Parts XIV-XX), reviewed, 334
- Humbert, Agnes M., her *Verbal Repetition in the 'Ancien Rite'* reviewed, 230
- Humors, *The*, and *Shakespeare's Characters*, by J. W. Draper, reviewed, 234
- Hutchinson, F. E., review by, 60
- James, Henry, *Henry James and the Art of Foreshortening*, article by M. Roberts, 207
- Jeffares, A. N., article on *The Byzantine Poems of W. B. Yeats*, 44
- Johnson, S., *Mrs. Piozzi's Omissions from Johnson's Letters to Thrales*, article by R. W. Chapman, 17; Dr. Johnson on the Imagination, note by W. B. C. Watkins, 131; *Two Centuries of Johnsonian Scholarship*, by R. W. Chapman, reviewed, 241; *Johnson and Boswell*, by B. H. Bronson, noticed, 75
- Jones, H. M., his *Ideas in America* reviewed, 151
- Jones, Sir W., *Sir William Jones's Chinese Studies*, article by T. C. Fan, 304
- Jonson, B., letter on Shakespeare and Jonson, by W. W. Greg, 58
- Jump, J. D., note on Matthew Arnold and the *Saturday Review*, 322
- Kahrl, G. M., his *Tobias Smollett, Traveler-Novelist* noticed, 156
- Kennedy, C. W., *The Earliest English Poetry*, reviewed, 137
- King Lear*, the staging of, letter by W. W. Greg, 229; *The True Text of 'King Lear'*, by L. Kirschbaum, reviewed, 230
- King, Dr. William, *The Phalaris Controversy: King versus Bentley*, article by C. J. Horne, 289
- King, R. W., reviews by, 142, 242, 243,
- Kirschbaum, L., *The True Text of 'King Lear'*, reviewed, 230
- 'Knack to know a Knave, A', *The Genesis of Dramatic Satire against the Puritan*, as illustrated in, article by Mary G. M. Adkins, 81
- Knight, G. Wilson, letter on *Timon of Athens*, 325
- Le Comte, E. S., his *Endymion in England. The Literary History of a Greek Myth* reviewed, 64
- Lederer, J., article on *John Donne and the Emblematic Practice*, 182
- Leishman, J. B., review by, 236; notice by, 156
- Lewis, W. S., *The Yale Edition of Horace Walpole's Correspondence* (Vols XI-XII), reviewed, 67
- Liljegren, S. B., his *Essence and Attitude in English Romanticism* reviewed, 242
- Literary Study and the Scholarly Profession*, by H. Craig, reviewed, 150
- Lockhart, *John Gibson*, by G. S. Gordon, noticed, 251
- Low, D. M., reviews by, 67, 151, 153
- Long, Mary McD., *The English Strong Verb from Chaucer to Caxton*, reviewed, 251
- Macbeth*, note on *The Bleeding Captain* scene in, by J. M. Nosworthy, 126
- Macdonald, H., reviews by, 152
- McManaway, J. G., *A Check List of English Plays, 1641-1700*, reviewed, 328
- Malone, E., *The Correspondence of Thomas Percy and Edmond Malone*, ed. A. Tillotson, reviewed, 140
- Man and his Works*, by E. L. Thorndike, reviewed, 148
- Marchand, L. A., his *Letters of Thomas Hood* reviewed, 243
- Mardekhar, B. S., his *Two Lectures on an Aesthetic of Literature* reviewed, 73
- Mare, W. de la, his ed. *Essays by Divers Hands*, (Vol. XXI) reviewed, 153
- Martin, L. C., review by, 243
- Martz, Edwin M., see Walpole.
- Masson, David, letter on his *Diagram of Milton's Spaces*, by A. J. A. Waldock, 56
- Matthews, W., his *English Pronunciation and Shorthand in the Early Modern Period* reviewed, 147
- Meyerstein, E. H. W., note on P. Maas's previous note on *Richard III*, l.i.32, 53
- Milton, J., note on *Paradise Lost*, by B. A. Wright, 130; note on his use of the word 'Danger', by B. A. Wright, 225; letter on Masson's *Diagram of Milton's*

- Spaces, by A. J. A. Waldock, 56; reply by B. A. Wright, 56; *From Virgil to Milton*, by C. M. Bowra, reviewed, 330; *John Milton's Complete Poetical Works* (Vol. 1), ed. H. F. Fletcher, reviewed, 138; *Prophets of Heaven and Hell. Virgil, Dante, Milton, Goethe*, by C. R. Buxton, reviewed, 243
- Moorman, J. R. H., his *Church Life in England in the Thirteenth Century*, reviewed, 60
- More, L. T., *The Life and Works of the Honourable Robert Boyle*, reviewed, 65
- Newspapers, Circulation of, in the Early Nineteenth Century*, article by A. Aspinall, 29
- Nichol Smith, D., *Essays on the Eighteenth Century*, presented to him in honour of his seventieth birthday, reviewed, 238
- Nineteenth Century, Circulation of Newspapers in the Early*, article by A. Aspinall, 29
- Nosworthy, J. M., article on *The Structural Experiment in 'Hamlet'*, 282; note on *The Bleeding Captain scene in Macbeth*, 126
- Novel, *Henry James and the Art of Fore-shortening*, article by M. Roberts, 207
- Old English Gnostic Verses, the, note on the 'Frisian Sailor' passage, in the, by L. Whitbread, 215
- Old English Poetry, *Notes on*, article by K. Sisam, 257
- Ovid, *Thyn Owne Book: A Note on Chaucer, Gower and Ovid*, article by N. Callan, 269
- Paradise Lost*, note on, by B. A. Wright, 130
- Percy, T., Percy's 'Hau Kiou Choaam', article by T. C. Fan, 117; *The Correspondence of Thomas Percy and Edmond Malone*, ed. A. Tillotson, reviewed, 140
- Periodical Literature, Summary of, by Kathleen Tillotson, 76, 158, 252, 342
- Phalaris Controversy, The: King versus Bentley*, article by C. J. Horne, 289
- Piozzi, Hester Lynch, Mrs. Piozzi's *Omissions from Johnson's Letters to Thrales*, article by R. W. Chapman, 17
- Powell, L. F., review by, 140
- Pronunciation, English, and Shorthand in the Early Modern Period*, by W. Matthews, reviewed, 147
- Redpath, T., reviews by, 73, 148, 249
- Richard III*, note by E. H. W. Meyerstein on P. Maas's previous note, 53
- Richey, Margaret F., review by, 61
- Roberts, M., article on *Henry James and the Art of Fore-shortening*, 207
- Rochester, Earl of, *Rochester's 'A Session of the Poets'*, article by J. H. Wilson, 109; *Rochester or Fishbourne: A Question of Authorship*, article by R. M. Baine, 201
- Romanticism, Essence and Attitude in English*, by S. B. Liljegren, reviewed, 242
- Saturday Review*, Matthew Arnold and the, note by J. D. Jump, 322
- Scheurweghs, G., his ed. *Nicholas Udall's 'Roister Doister'* reviewed, 327
- Schlegel, G. D., review by, 59
- Scott, W., note by A. Aspinall on Walter Scott's baronetcy, 319; *A Bibliography of Sir Walter Scott*, by J. C. Corson, noticed, 157
- Schubert, L., his *Hawthorne the Artist: Fine-Art devices in Fiction* reviewed, 333
- Seaton, Ethel, note on *Antony and Cleopatra and the Book of Revelation*, 219
- Sensabaugh, G. F., *The Tragic Muse of John Ford*, reviewed, 235
- Shakespeare, W., *'Timon of Athens': A Reconsideration*, article by A. S. Collins, 96; *The Structural Experiment in 'Hamlet'*, article by J. M. Nosworthy, 282; note on *The Bleeding Captain scene in Macbeth*, by J. M. Nosworthy, 126; *Antony and Cleopatra and the Book of Revelation*, note by Ethel Seaton, 219; note on the supposed crux in *The Tempest*, by P. Simpson, 224; note on Falstaff and Smollett's Micklewhimmen, by R. B. Heilman, 226; letter on Shakespeare and Jonson, by W. W. Greg, 58; letter on the staging of *King Lear* by W. W. Greg, 229; letter on *Timon of Athens* by G. Wilson Knight, 325; *The Humors and Shakespeare's Characters*, by J. W. Draper, reviewed, 234; *The True Text of 'King Lear'*, by L. Kirschbaum, reviewed, 230
- Shorthand, English Pronunciation and, in the Early Modern Period*, by W. Matthews, reviewed, 147
- Simmons, J., his *Southey* reviewed, 142
- Simpson, P., note on the supposed crux in *The Tempest*, 224
- Sisam, K., *Notes on Old English Poetry*, 257
- Sisson, C. J., review by, 246

- Smollett, T., note on Falstaff and Smollett's Micklewhimmen, by R. B. Heilman, 226; *Tobias Smollett, Traveler-Novelist*, by G. M. Kahrl, noticed, 156
- Southey, R., note on his revision of *Life of Wesley*, 134; *Southey*, by J. Simmons, reviewed, 142
- Stallknecht, N. P., his *Strange Seas of Thought. Studies in William Wordsworth's Philosophy of Man and Nature* reviewed, 69
- Steele, Richard, *Tracts and Pamphlets* by, by Rae Blanchard, reviewed, 240
- Strong Verb, *The English, from Chaucer to Caxton*, by Mary McD. Long, reviewed, 251
- Sutherland, J. R., review by, 66
- Swift, J., *An Exhibition of Printed Books at the University of Texas, October 19-December 31, 1945*, described by Autry N. Wiley, reviewed, 334
- Taylor, W. D., review by, 63
- Tempest, The*, note on the supposed crux in, by P. Simpson, 224
- Theatre, *A Comparison between the Two Stages: A late Restoration Book of the Theatre*, by S. B. Wells, reviewed, 66
- Thomson, M. A., review by, 240
- Thorndike, E. L., his *Man and his Works* reviewed, 148
- Tillotson, A., his ed. *The Correspondence of Thomas Percy and Edmond Malone* reviewed, 140
- Tillotson, Kathleen, Summary of Periodical Literature, 76, 158, 252, 342
- '*Timon of Athens*': *A Reconsideration*, article by A. S. Collins, 96; *Timon of Athens*, letter by G. Wilson Knight, 325
- Tompkins, J. M. S., article on '*In Yonder Grave a Druid Lies*', by William Collins, 1; note on Tourneur and the Stars, 315; notice by, 156
- Tourneur and the Stars, note by J. M. S. Tompkins, 315
- Traherne, Thomas, by Gladys I. Wade, reviewed, 236
- Trueblood, P. G., *The Flowering of Byron's Genius: Studies in Byron's 'Don Juan'*, reviewed, 332
- Udall, N., *Nicholas Udall's 'Roister Doister'*, ed. G. Scheurweghs, reviewed, 327
- Utley, F. L., *The Crooked Rib. An Analytical Index to the Argument about Women in English and Scots Literature to the end of the Year 1568*, reviewed, 63
- Wade, Gladys I., her *Thomas Traherne* reviewed, 236
- Waldock, A. J. A., letter on Masson's Diagram of Milton's Spaces, 56
- Wallace, A. D., his *The Yale Edition of Horace Walpole's Correspondence* (Vols. xi-xiii) reviewed, 67
- Walpole, H., *The Yale Edition of Horace Walpole's Correspondence* (Vols. xi-xiii), ed. W. S. Lewis and A. D. Wallace with the assistance of C. H. Bennett and Edwine M. Martz, reviewed, 67
- Watkins, W. B. C., note on Dr. Johnson on the Imagination, 131
- Wells, S. B., his ed. *A Comparison between the Two Stages: A late Restoration Book of the Theatre* reviewed, 66
- Wesley, J., note on Southey's revision of his *Life of Wesley*, 134
- Whitbread, L., note on the 'Frisian Sailor' passage in the Old English Gnostic Verses, 215
- White, Beatrice, reviews by, 230,
- Wiley, Autry N., *An Exhibition of Printed Books at the University of Texas, October 19-December 31, 1945*, reviewed, 334
- Williams, Edna R., *The Conflict of Homonyms in English*, reviewed, 74
- Williams, H., review by, 334
- Wilson, J. H., article on Rochester's '*A Session of the Poets*', 109
- Women, *The Crooked Rib. An Analytical Index to the Argument about Women in English and Scots Literature to the end of the Year 1568*, by F. L. Utley, reviewed, 63
- Woodward, Gertrude L., *A Check List of English Plays, 1641-1700*, reviewed, 328
- Wordsworth, W., *Strange Seas of Thought. Studies in William Wordsworth's Philosophy of Man and Nature*, by N. P. Stallknecht, reviewed, 69
- Wrenn, C. L., review by, 147
- Wright, B. A., note on *Paradise Lost*, 130; note on Milton's use of the word 'Danger', 225; reply to A. J. A. Waldock's letter on Masson's Diagram of Milton's Spaces, 56; review by, 330
- Yeats, W. B., *The Byzantine Poems of*, article by A. N. Jeffares, 44

PRINTED IN GREAT BRITAIN BY
WILLIAM CLOWES AND SONS, LIMITED,
LONDON AND BECCLES.

